THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. VII SEPTEMBER, 1923 No. 39

EDITORIAL

The English Church has suffered a great loss in the death of two men of very different gifts and character, who passed to their rest in July. The Bishop of Chelmsford's strenuous life has been fully appreciated in the Press; but it is not generally known what a valuable part he played in the preliminary meetings which prepared the way for the appointment of the Commission on Christian Doctrine. His great love of God, and his devotion to the task of men's redemption, gave him an insight into the fundamental motives of many with whom he disagreed; and he believed that this underlying unity could and should be expressed in common thought and teaching. Nothing was more characteristic of him than the message which he sent from his sick-bed to the Anglo-Catholic Congress; nor can we imagine anything that the members of the Congress would more wish to carry away with them than the spirit of that farewell.

Mr. C. W. Emmet's powers lay in far other directions than the Bishop of Chelmsford's, though those who knew him in his West Hendred days were well aware what a devoted and skilful parish priest he was. But he was primarily a theologian. More than most he seemed to us to have imbibed, as indeed he desired to do, the spirit of Dr. Sanday. This gave to his Modernism a constructive and deeply reverent character which made his paper at the celebrated Girton Conference of 1921 more than an ephemeral utterance. As he showed in his last work, *The Lord of Thought*, he had all the Modernist's love of pursuing a hypothesis to its extreme conclusion—even if sometimes, as we believe, this meant doing violence to the evidence; but he never forgot the religious values nor allowed them to become

secondary to criticism. His death will be a great loss to the Commission on Christian Doctrine, of which he was a member; for he had a deep and wide learning, and desired that all knowledge should subserve the better love of the brethren.

We trust that the eloquent plea made by the Bishop of St. Albans at the closing service of the Anglo-Catholic Congress for the better post-ordination education of the clergy will not pass unheeded; though the fact that one of the last acts of the retiring Bishop of Liverpool was to make provision for that end in his diocese shows that the need is coming to be recognized. In other dioceses also much has already been done. We feel sure that the Bishops will receive the backing of their clergy, if they will take them into full and frank consultation as to the subjects such education should deal with. What is wanted is "Applied Theology," concrete and detailed, and aiming at the formation of a common mind among the clergy of the diocese as to the applications (not necessarily uniform) of Anglican principles to the manifold duties of the priest's vocation.

We have received a spirited protest from a Cambridge Professor against the observations we ventured to make last month upon the occupation of the Ruhr; and we regret having to hold it over until October, owing to exigencies of space. Meanwhile we may say that we stand by all that we wrote. The evidence for the cruelties and injustices involved in this occupation is ample and varied: the mere figures, running into thousands, of families ejected and despoiled of all that they possess are sufficient. We do not doubt that the French soldiery behave as well as can be expected; but they are the tools of an illegal policy, and must obey orders. We are grateful to our Government for having stated unequivocally the British attitude; and we trust that the principles they enunciate will provide a rallying-point for the public opinion of the world—not excluding America.

"GOD: GOD AND MAN"*

YOUR purpose is the greatest and, properly considered, the clearest possible. You desire to recall the holy Name of God, to make that Name sound more clearly in our English world, to set all our interests under the Name—that is, under the protection, and under the control—of God, to make all men and all things serve the glory of the Name, that is to say, the Glory of God. That first; and, indeed, first, last, and all the time.

And then, within the great purpose, your desire is to serve the cause of man and especially the cause of man where service is most needed—that is, the cause of the multitude. You know well the importance of the few. You know how truly the kingdom of God is served in the real sanctification and growing knowlege of those that most believe. You know how much need there is of an intensive work, and remember always that the "best," the most active in that "band of men and women whose hearts God hath touched," are found in places unexpected of the world, and are at least as likely to be among the laborious and the unlearned as in any class, if such a class there could be, of believing and worshipping experts.

But though you prize the few as highly as any can prize them, you feel and say that your most urgent calling is towards the *many*. You intend that your movement, or this your new wave in the old tide of movement, shall be in a very particular sense missionary. Like the Patriarch (Job xxxi. 17), you are indignant that of the Heavenly Bread you should "have eaten your morsel alone." You mean, in a good sense, to *popularize* the name of Christ. You would be among the sworn servants of Him who declared Himself "anointed to preach the Gospel to the poor."

Yes, you are not content—let me say we are not content—without a forward, spreading life. You long for the day when what is known and loved by some shall be known and loved by all; yes, and known far better then by those who know it now; for it is only when the earth is filled with the knowledge of God that any, the most privileged, soul shall truly know Him. From the brightness of that day we shall look back upon the greatest light of this day as upon twilight, a dawning light, shining a little, but bound to shine more and more until the full day when God shall be glorious in *all* His saints.

And further, as you desire many men to know, so you desire that those interests of the multitude which are at present

* A paper read at the Anglo-Catholic Congress, July, 1923.

distinguished from religious interests should no longer thus be separated. You mean to take all people into your view, but also the whole range of their lives. Oh! It is in the common doings of common nature, in peace and in war, in happiness and in sorrow, and, above all, in that constant work which is the common lot—it is in all this that you mean to find the sphere of the Gospel and the Sacraments.

Once more, you mean to serve the future; to range not only wide in social extension, but also far ahead into the morrow of our race. You are children of the morning and of the day. And as you are impatient to do a work which shall be useful, divinely useful, in the future time, so you have a great regard for the children in whom the future is already beautifully enshrined before our eyes.

Well then, we are going to judge and keep in high case our doings in this Congress by referring them to the test of these two great purposes. About everything we shall ask, "Will this serve my two purposes, the Glory of God and the good of the many—in one word, the Glory of God in the hearts of the many?"

In my imagination you have traced upon your Congress Banner, and mean to embroider there in gold of thought and high resolve, these great words, "God and the People." And this device will not only restrain and direct, it will *enkindle* our hearts. It will run like a spark or a note—a singing spark, a shining note—through all your discussions. It will do more than enkindle, it will animate. For it must keep us all in touch with God, the source of all being and life, and with that created life upon which in the holy Incarnation He has so wondrously set His Name, making man in His own image by a double gift, first by man's creation, and secondly by God's birth.

I

So, then, you have directed me to begin with a reverent thought about God. What I offer in response to your direction is not argument nor information, but truisms, acknowledged by all Christians, though not recognized by all Christians in the terms I have to use because they are the best I can find at this time. Again, I do not offer you a proof of the existence of God—for no less than this existence is our tremendous subject—drawn from reason, revelation, or experience, whether corporate or individual, or from all three combined, as they must in any secure argument be combined. My purpose is only to state what the *place* of belief in God and of thought about God is in all Christian reflection, purpose, and practice. That place is easily stated, not easily preserved.

It is a place altogether primary and fundamental. It is the first element, and it is the foundation of all others. Moreover, it is a living, moving, growing foundation. I do not mean that the truth about God grows, but our thought about Him grows. It moves throughout all our other thoughts and purposes, and becomes in all those other processes more incessantly manifest, felt, and operative. I mean, it is not a thought or a purpose once grasped and once formulated, and afterwards left behind us as a secure possession. Nor is it a thought that, everywhere operative and important, becomes hidden though prized, as some of the great principles of physical law or of mathematical conception become hidden or unexpressed in later stages of discovery or invention.

It is unquestioned and unquestionable. But it is not in a certain common sense of the words "taken for granted." On the contrary, the result of each movement of truly Christian thought is the demand for a further *manifestation* of this fundamental element.

The habit of reliance upon faith in God makes the faith in God more and more explicit; the habit of loyalty to the will of God makes that will more and more known, more and more particular and insistent and detailed. The heart that knows, in a knowledge too clear for words, the truth shadowed in the utterance,

"O God, Thou art my God,"

cries also—

"Show Thou me the Way that I should walk in, for I lift up my soul unto Thee."

To believe in God and to trust God is to know better every day how great is the claim of His truth and His law in every moment and turn of life.

It follows that the theology of the Incarnation, of the Spirit, of Grace, of Church, of the Saints, of Sacraments, of Conduct, of Politics, depends entirely and at every step on the primary belief in God, Almighty, Holy, Immense, Eternal, Simple, Unchangeable, Free, and Loving. And, on the other hand, every step in that knowledge of Christ, Spirit, Grace, Sacraments, secures to the soul as to the Church a fresh significance in, and a nearer approach to, the primary conception of God.

For the Christian knowledge of God is not an abstract theism upon which may afterwards be inscribed the special qualities of Christianity or of what is sometimes called Incarnational thought. On the contrary, in the result and just in so far as the knowledge advances towards completeness, it is seen to be wholly wrapt up and included in the knowledge of Christ, the influence of the Spirit, and the fellowship and

experience of the Body which God in Christ has called into being, maintains in life, and leads towards perfection. Only in the Son Incarnate do we securely know Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and Christ has taught us both by recorded word and by repeated experience that we do not really abide in Him unless we "love the brethren"; unless we live our lives for their sake and in the sympathy of a genuine spiritual community.

Moreover, the knowledge is sustained only while it grows. In this science to cease to learn is to begin to forget; and we learn not only by the message of revelation and under the pressure of circumstance, but also in the energy—at its best, the profoundly restful energy—of prayer. The habit of grateful, affectionate, and confident prayer does much to fortify even the "intellectual" conviction of God's unity, living power, and loving-kindness. Some who do not yet use the blessing of faith will say that by such a habit we create for ourselves and in ourselves the Father we worship.

But those who seeking have found, or have been found when they were lost, will not be able to banish themselves again or to recapture the temper of denial or even the misery of doubt.

We may even say that if the Philosopher knows God as the necessary source of Being "physical" and "moral," we petitioners conceive God more vividly and more habitually as the love that meets our incessant desire; we penitents require God as the Lord to whom belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against Him. "O Thou that hearest the prayer, unto Thee shall all flesh come."

We men who come together, bringing with us to this famous public place all the devotion of our quiet churches—who come not to show our numbers or importance or to secure any point against critics, but really with the earnest desire to make to the general religious thought and feeling some contribution not out of tune with the great blessings we have received—must begin our effort in the reverent contemplation of God, because that contemplation is alone primary and fundamental. But this commencement will have a fresh beginning, will take a new breath, in each further step we make; in all attempts to learn and in every word used in learning. For the conception is not only primary, it is *continuously* necessary and vital. It is the beginning, the process, and the end of all Christian knowledge, of the knowledge of man as well as the knowledge of God. For only in the knowledge of God do we come to know man, whether ourselves or others.

Though they were inspired, yet it was in the thought of God that the prophets came to think rightly of the nations. It

was in the *awareness* of God that the Prophets became aware of what was really happening in the world. And as the thought of God sustains all thought, so the *desire* to be true to it, or rather, to be true to God, is the beginning, the process and the end of every Christian *desire* and purpose. It is in the love of God that we truly love one another.

Thoughts and purposes must alike be judged by their constant fidelity to this foundation belief; and every action, in so far as it is truly Christian, is continually animated by the foundation mercy of God's Being, and of the revelation of that Being to us His creatures.

We begin then our conference with this prayer,

> "Thou, Lord, art in the midst of us,
> And Thy Name has been invoked upon us.
> Leave us not."*

It is only by the constancy of this thought and belief that our superstructure of thought can attain reverence, tenderness, patience, true wisdom. It is for lack of real constancy and insistence in this belief that our actions sometimes become slight and unworthy; our accents shrill and unconvincing.

We make an application of this principle to the particular actions of public worship. In respect of all matters of external ceremony it is not only excusable, it is not only inevitable, it is desirable that, within certain limits, men should vary. They need not differ, but they may vary—and vary not only from each other, but from themselves at different times. And as for the limits of variation, our great safeguard lies in the incessant direction of the whole action as worship to God. One extreme is the over-elaboration that may weigh down the spirit—for the spirit is a timid fellow, absurdly impressed by magnificence—such elaboration of music and movement as belonged to the eloquent old Anglican services—those Cathedral "chauntings" that Cardinal Newman found seductive. And the other extreme is the almost jealous puritanism of some Catholics that leaves us, it must be confessed, a little on the dry and bony side, and approaches the rigidly practical or "necessary minimum" use of the varied and entertaining faculties of man. Against both of these extremes reality is the safeguard; and this reality is the offering in general intention and, as far as possible, in conscious employment of every word and movement, the dedication of every sound capacity to the worship—dutiful, grateful, confident, joyful—of the Lord God Almighty, Who hath set upon us His most holy Name.

It is not an easy thing to worship God in spirit and reality.

* A wonderful sermon was preached on this text before the University of Oxford, I think on June 3, by the Dean of Wells.

" We do not," said Father Benson, " lift up our hearts by accident." This worship will mean much courage, some sacrifice of curiosity and fancy. Is it quite certain we are husbanding our resources of worship ? There are moments when the question can be answered with a confident " Yes," for faith varies not only from man to man, but also from time to time. Some men's faith, and any man's faith sometimes, is so exuberant in energy that it asks for more movements to direct, more words to say, more stuff to dedicate and redeem. And there are other times and other people that find some expressions a little too costly for our present wealth of spirit. For faith has its varied *moods* as well as its varying strength, and at one time plunges into a scene it knows to be God's, and at another time must fly from the spectacle of the world to clear its eyes. And so there have always been in the Catholic Church services both simple and august; and the public services have been supported by an unseen life of very simple prayer. In our mission work this is not in the least forgotten, and it is seldom enough that the " poor " have the chance of being distracted by splendid ceremonial. There is no fear of that, but " we are all of us weak at times," and must remember the danger of other diversions from the one object of worship. Remember it is not only uninstructed persons who may step aside from the great road. Remember that saints have longed for the great simplicity of prayer, and have approached this simplicity only after years of training. How they have longed to get beyond mental images, descriptions, great words, and burning thoughts; to tread underfoot in the Cloud of Unknowing every imagination that seemed to compete with reality, to come between the naked soul and the essentially invisible Glory ! How they have longed to escape to that Presence which is too close to be an encounter, in that love that endures no eloquence, in a peace too deep to name itself by any name. . . .

So, then, the constant remembrance of God secures reverence, tenderness, patience with one another, reality. And by reality I mean more even than absolute directness and sincerity with regard to the purposes, great or small, of this visible world, and of the changing human society in which we have a part, even when we include under these heads the actions of consecrated worship. I mean something more than this—and how much this is—by the preservation of reality. I mean—we all mean—by this reality, a preservation of the sense of the unseen and the eternal.

I have seen somewhere lately the title of a book, *The Dream and the Business*. The title seems to me to point to the two halves of daily experience. There is the " Dream " of towns

and countryside; of crowds and movement; of poverty and wealth; the "Dream" of assemblies and Church Councils. And, on the other hand, there is the "Business": the search for God, the finding of God, the secure activity of prayer.

Sometimes the Dream is very enthralling or very terrible. It is only dream if you take it as of final and independent importance. What do I mean by this? Do I merely challenge with fanciful, high-flown, or paradoxical words, the natural sense of the reality and importance of earthly or of external ecclesiastical events? No. Take this instance. A man is in great pain—great all the time, and lasting many years; or he is in disgrace, or bereavement, or galled by ingratitude. Well, while this man finds the centre of his thought in other men or in himself, that pain (whether of body or of soul) can hardly be relieved. It grows to agony, to fever. It pre-occupies, imprisons, paralyzes. But if worship rises to God, Eternal, Immortal, Invisible, Infinitely Good, and, in His Goodness, Unchangeable, the Unfailing Source of Strength and Light; then, and just so far as this worship endures, patience becomes so sure that it almost ceases to be patience.

The loss of friends grown cold can be endured, while yet the heart remains soft for the friend that is gone. Your selfish attachment to him is part of the Dream. The Business is the Love of God that is never disappointed and the love of man in God. Do you know what I am speaking of? Then you know that it is no effort of fancy or of spiritual arrogance when we say that there is a Reality much more convincing than all the solidities of earth. "There is an hour," says George Herbert, "wherein a man may be happy all his life, can he but find it." It is but an hour in the measures of the clock and the breathing, and it comes to an end. But it has in it something of an eternal quality and blessing, and in it, as from a tower, the soul sees the whole of time under the light of Eternity, and knows the will of God is good. Then, escaping from the bewildering detail, the thorny maze, the barbed entanglements of the world, we find a peace quite firm-set in reality.

But then when we have escaped we turn our regard again on the external scene, physical, social, ecclesiastical, and find it real after all, real for the first time in a true but derived reality. It is only in the worship of the Unseen that we become true servants of the world, and what is true of "the rest" now, is true also of those ages to come of which we spoke at the beginning. The worship of the Unseen makes us good servants of the neighbour, and the worship of the Eternal makes us faithful warriors of the future. In fact, it is just when a man in a sense turns away from the world to seek for the Creator

that he becomes able either to see the world justly or to serve the world effectively.

For then, as we said, it is seen to have a true though second reality. It is shone through by a light of truth. It becomes real in the Beam. Only when it is regarded as self-subsistent, only when it shines by its own light is the world an unreal dream, a seductive vision or a terrifying nightmare. In the light of the Eternal it appears smaller but solid, no longer tremendous, but now lovable, for it is the object of Divine Love; no longer an impending grandeur, but now a genuine jewel, made by God, depending on God, preserved by God.

II

This brings me to the second part of the proposition which is in effect put into my hands. What is this proposition? It is double. First, God is God alone. Secondly, God hath given being to all that is, and in particular to us whom He preserves, forgives, saves and calls to know, to worship and to love Him.

If we welcome the setting of the Divine Name at the head of our words, as the foundation of our thoughts, so we welcome the division that is proposed for those thoughts—I mean the division of the subject into these two parts: first God, the Divine Glory and Being, considered alone; and secondly, God, the Creator of all, and of us who worship Him, and now "have boldness" to speak to one another of Him.

Another division is sometimes used, the division of the subject under the heads of God Transcendent and God Immanent—that is to say, indwelling, penetrating, and upholding the known universe. Such a division has its advantages, and now that the limits that divide the notion of an Immanent God from a non-moral Pantheism—that is, from the conception of a God, without intelligence, holiness, will or love, who is no more than the sum of the universe we know or conjecture—are generally understood, this conception is free from peril. It is all the more free from peril, because of a natural growth of thought. When first this way of speaking was revived, there was a suggestion that immanence and transcendence were alternatives. It is now understood that if we believe Him to be immanent, we must at the same time believe Him to be transcendent—that is to say, infinitely far from being comprised in His universe or measured by it either in greatness and power, or in moral perfection and loving will.

Still, the advantage for popular devout thought of taking the notion of immanence in place of the notion of creation—when the latter word is given a wide and reasonable meaning—is not great. The word "immanence" has been thought to give relief

to our intelligence, and to make belief easier; and this it certainly does, if it is used simply to replace the Deistic conception of a really limited and removed God, acting upon the world from outside it. But we best correct this notion by a more careful use of the word "creation." And meanwhile, if "immanence" is felt to be a relief, it is largely because of two unobserved antecedent notions: (1) That we know a good deal about the universe; and (2) that the universe is somehow given and known, apart from God, and is ready for God to dwell in and to be found in; and both these notions are quite without any foundation.

Let us return then at least for to-day to the familiar words enshrining immense and very awful realities, that God is Himself supreme, perfect, and self-sufficing, living from all eternity in a reality of mutual love; and that God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, hath called into existence the whole universe of creation, according to the law and type of the Eternal Word, to be ordered and animated by the Divine Spirit.

Now at this point one has the opportunity to turn to some criticism of modes of thought about creation which were formerly supposed to find a stumbling-block in the conclusions of the conjectures of science. These ways of thought were themselves creative. They created the celebrated conflict between Religion and Science. That such a conflict has no rational warrant we must take some other opportunity of showing. Only observe that this afternoon all that class of reflections is deliberately left on one side. This is done in order to win time for a few notes which have that direct bearing to-day upon religious interests which was formerly possessed by questions about development and creation.

For the purpose of these notes, I want to pass directly from the thought of creation in general, to the thought of the creation of moral beings, which for our purpose means the creation of man.

The creature in presence of the Creator—that is to say, at all times, but consciously when the creature is brought in consciousness before the Creator—is totally and absolutely dependent upon the Creator. From God the creature, man, has being, moral sense, an end, a purpose, the means of acting, the judgment to decide, the desire of good, the power to fulfil a good desire.* How this is true in the mystery of the Redeemer's kingdom we know full well. There, in redemption, we know that Grace alone, the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, makes us both to will and to do of God's good pleasure.

* Fénélon makes the sense of self witness to God. "*Ce Dieu qui m'a fait m'a donné moi-même à moi-même. Le moi que j'aime tant n'est qu'un présent de sa bonté. Ce Dieu doit donc être en moi, et moi en lui, s'il m'est permis de parler ainsi, puisque c'est de lui que je tiens ce moi.*" (*Lettres sur la Religion*, Œuvres. Paris, Leroux, 1851, t. i., p. 96.)

But the same is true of the creature as creature, and not only as saved. While he is lost, it is not true in every sense. But in a perfect, unfallen creature, there would be that dependence and that reception of power and light to which the fallen creature is recalled by an act of mercy, lifted by a rescue. and a translation into the Kingdom of Grace. Dare I say the natural power of the unfallen man would be what we now know as Grace; that his natural knowledge would be inspiration, his natural science revelation, the knowledge and the love of God? Not quite. For such words might carry a meaning precisely opposed to mine. I do not wish my little paper to be condemned with the *damnatæ propositiones Baii* upon which discipline fell in the Pontificate of St. Pius V. in 1567. That would be a dismal beginning for this respectable Congress. And besides, so far as I understand the matter, Baius was accused of meaning that what we know as nature could do the work of Grace. What I mean is that man is only truly man in that condition which is now, under redemption, known as Grace; that he is man in virtue of his reception of God.

We must remember, indeed, that in an unfallen man there would still be a distinction between natural innocence and the supernatural bestowal of righteousness; between the gifts of ordinary reason that constitute in a man a normal reaction to the world, and the gift of wisdom that receives the vision of Divine Glory. Both the natural excellence and the supernatural endowment are constantly given by God, and are ours only as gifts. And we may safely say that the true purpose of man unfallen, the end of creation, was such a welcome to the Divine Glory as now we know as Grace.

I beg you to consider this as carrying with it two consequences. First, our present state of real dependence upon God and our present wisdom of conscious dependence upon God do not indicate a fall from perfection in the creature. Secondly, the sovereignty of God and our recognition of that sovereignty do not mean that our attitude —rightly altogether subject and dependent—is rightly altogether abject and self-contemptuous.

Let us take the second first. Abjection has reference to a contrasted person who is only relatively great—great because greater than ourselves, even overwhelmingly greater. In the grip of Cæsar, the unprivileged man is abject, helpless, socially and politically nothing. Even in an earthly king, just so far as he is intended to be a devout shadow of the Divine Majesty, there is something recalling the creative power. The king's face gives grace. It is when confronted by a tyrant that a man is nothing. Confronted by a king, he is noble. And certainly man is not humanly, morally, religiously nothing over

against God. We are the creatures of His hand, the sheep of His pasture. We hold from His loving purpose, all our being, hope, reason, the soul's life. We hold from His pardon, everything that belongs to peace. His mercy is not an occasional resource like the mercy of a powerful creditor. It is the sole and ever-necessary condition of our smallest tendency towards spiritual wealth. If we buy of Him, we must buy with His own coin, like children of a Father. His mercy is not required in rare crises. It embraceth us on every side. But, on the other hand, it does on every side so embrace us. We are compassed about with songs of deliverance which are the ordinary, the normal, the regular music of our march.

In this mercy—the mercy of creation and redemption—we are somewhat real. Our wills have another duty and function than that of self-obliteration. They are redeemed precisely for this. The end of the divine, the almighty, mercy is that the creature whose feet were set on the lowest rungs of reality should rise by genuine effort, God-inspired, to the height of self-determination in worship and in life; should mount the steps of a throne and receive a real crown of excellence and of freedom, the glorious liberty of the children of God; not less a crown because its end is to be cast by the redeemed, and now triumphant, will upon the sea of glass that is before the one Throne from which all thrones have their majesty; before the Fatherhood after which every fatherhood—every new originating power—in heaven and earth is named.

If in our thoughts we make man a puppet or a slave, we diminish in our thoughts the glory of God, and describe His creative will as helpless or else His creative act as illusory, denying the honour in the one case of His power, and in the other of His holiness.

The nature God has called into being is not only real, it is significant, and significant of God. He speaks to us through it; and it is to our own grave loss that we neglect to hear this message. Let us encourage one another to conceive that this humanity, this human nature from which we sometimes wish to withdraw ourselves, may be, more than we think, a revelation of the Eternal, the Incomprehensible. . . .

Do you know the mood—I dare say moderns never know the mood—in which you wonder whether perhaps the old rigidities of dogma may not perhaps be true, true in the old full sense of exactness and actuality? The old exactness may after all be exactly true. I invite you to the same conjecture of the possible truth of the lessons that come to us from common human nature. How if these notices also are authentic, authoritative? How if they also tell something real about God? Do you

think it is for nothing that the Almighty has called the creature, man, into existence, and made him, or allowed him to become so convincing, so interesting, so noble, so base, so humorous, and so tragic? Do you say only tragic, humorous, base, noble, interesting to *us* his fellow-dust? Very well: since he is all this to us, did God mean this significance to us to mislead *us*, this thrill that man gives us to be utterly uninspiring; this message man brings to *us*, the fellow-men, to be utterly empty, a tale told by an idiot, all sound and fury, signifying—nothing? I cannot believe it. I find it hard to understand how any one who believes in the Incarnation can also believe this. If Mary's soul and Mary's voice could magnify the Lord, I find it impossible to suppose that my hard-featured, hard-handed neighbour gives no evidence of His glory. If Jesus is the Word of the Father, I find it hard to think that His brethren—so entitled, you know, in Scripture—give us no token of what the character of the Father really is. No. This human nature is not nothingness, and it is not machinery. It is not machinery, and it is not dead, *perinde ac cadaver*. It is alive and has a future; and I may learn something of God in its trials, its sorrows and joys, its efforts, failures, and partial successes. I must believe that if there are in many lives—the lives of the saints—shining proofs of the Divine Goodness and Power, sure there are in *every* life some great lights of revelation; some "forgiven injuries, conquered temptations (now and then), and difficulties conquered by endurance" (Thackeray: *Esmond*).

The life of the most ordinary poor man is a long course of such victories over circumstance as many of us would think to be remarkable and memorable if they occurred in one week or one day of our lives. Remember, the lives in which ruin is a tragedy, ruin which means having nothing but what you can earn, are lives very few in number, and the lives are many or unnumbered in which what we call ruin—that is, having nothing but what you can earn, is the constant, normal, honourable, and quite contented condition of existence. Remember this and then ask, or rather ask no more, whether human life is indeed nothing, whether it yields no evidence of the glory of God. . . .

I have taken first the second consequence. Let us for an ending return to the first.

I said the condition of dependence and the knowledge of dependence are not marks of a relative inferiority to our own better selves or more honourable possibilities. They are the mark and the condition of our essential perfection, the guide to our only conceivable advance. What do I mean? I mean

that the perfection of man cannot have been and never can be a solitary and self-subsistent perfection. A solitary and self-subsistent perfection would be a *second* perfection, however multitudinous in its development. It would be *another* perfection, a perfection additional to the perfection of God—that is to say, it would be another God: which is impossible and unthinkable—unthinkable, because when the name of "God" is given in different languages to a variety of supernatural beings, that name does not in the least mean what we mean by "God." The perfection that alone can come to be the creature's perfection is God Himself, no other, no less. He gives not His glory to a second, but He giveth *Himself* to the creature whom He has called into being, not so that the creature may contain and measure the incomprehensible Majesty, but that the creature may become a partaker with many others, in Christ, of the gift of the Divine Nature, the advent not once for all achieved, but incessantly renewed, of the Divine Presence.

Bear with me if I say that this is not a truth only for the reader or the bookshelf. It is a truth of the greatest practical importance and the most frequent usefulness. There is nothing here for you to learn from me. But there is something, I think, for you to teach and to teach far and wide. For there is no error men more instinctively welcome than the error that God is only occasionally needed by man; that God is a remedy against sin, a refuge in danger, a light in darkness, and that He is these things *alone*. Certainly He is light and safety and healing, but He is much more than these even in the measures of man's life. He is life. He is the law of our being; not our medicine, but our health; not our guide only, but our home; not our rescue, but our life, our all. And what is true of God is true in its measure of the knowledge and worship of God, of Religion.

A man may have tried to preach the Gospel in four of the five quarters of the world, in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America; to the learned and to the simple; in Cambridge, but also in Oxford; in peace and in war; ashore and afloat. Such a man, I conjecture, has found that everywhere the most unvarying objection made to religion is this, "Why should I accept religion when I get on well and keep good without it? Take your offer of grace to the 'poor,' to the prisons, to the disinherited races. For me, I am thankful to say, I live an honest and good life. When I fall into trouble, into faults, into disgrace or misery, it may be time enough to think of religion." We smile when we read of the priest at sea called to prayers in a storm, and replying, "Captain, I hope it's not come to that." We smile when, in Carlyle, we read how Sterling, the night his roof

was carried away by a hurricane, " felt he was in God's hands." I am not sure we ought to smile. But I am sure we ought to remember how, in the moral world, men often think they have no need of God, and therefore no need of Sacraments, no need of " religion," because they seem to be in smooth water, or to be navigating rough water well. I would have every Catholic in the Congress show in life, and many show in word, the great truth that God—His presence, His grace, His light—is not a remedy for occasional, however frequent, miseries and losses of men; but is man's sole health, sole wisdom, sole joy, sole full reality. When I hear it urged that a man has no need of God because of his own consciousness—remember, quite possibly a delusive consciousness—of high character, I seem to be listening to a lover who declares that he has a beautiful and entrancing wife, but that by a moderate and watchful life he has lived apart from her for years without bringing the most secret and the most passing cloud upon the honour of her name. There are thousands of men who under the pressure of duty have been forced to that hard fidelity and can most truly say they have achieved it. But these men do not regard their lives as specially crowned with emotional success. Or I seem to hear a learned man declare that he possesses a grand library, but that by faithful attendance at the cinema and careful distraction of his curiosities, he has managed to live without reading in his library or buying any books instead. I seem to hear a rich man who has a glorious home and never lived in it, boast that by rigid economy he has not left without paying his shot any of the lodgings and the Rowtons which have sheltered his head.

To such men as I have fancied, however eloquent and sincere they may be, I should answer, " Why have a lovely wife, and by your own choice forgo her society ? Why possess a great library, a glorious home, and contrive the means without necessity of doing without them ?" And to my neighbour as such, not as lover, lord, or student, but simply as man, I say, " Why have a lovely, a glorious God, and withhold yourself from knowing and loving Him? Why count yourself unworthy of eternal life now because you think you are managing this lower life respectably ?"

Now all this is the practical version of what before I said more bookishly. God and God alone is the true end of man. The creature was created not in a separate perfection, but in a capacity to receive perfection, even that sole perfection that is the Creator alone. Man's life is a vast emptiness, so vast that only the Infinite can fill it; a deep hunger of which God alone is the food; an immeasurable weakness whose need is a most

strong cry in the ears of the Almighty. *Pars mea Deus in æternum.* "My flesh and my heart faileth: but God is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever."

Is not dependence, then, great? Is not the fall of man a fall from dependence to a fancied and most unreal independence—from a real wealth that is all made up of receiving, to a frozen poverty that is imagined wealth?

And will not such a thought as this, so undeniable, so inevitable, guide us when we are inclined to forget God, and be a help to us when we come to consider, with Father Huntingdon, the meaning of sin and the character of that rescue from sin? This rescue Christ has accomplished for us by His most Precious Blood—that is to say, not by a sentence of indulgence, not by a brief act of authority, as when a King enlarges prisoners at his accessions, but by the laborious victory of a moral renewal and a moral re-establishment of that created nature whose ruin is to live apart from God, and whose glory is an entire welcome of the majestic generosity of God's self-bestowal.

* * * * *

But this, the first paper of our studies, must not end by taking you by the smallest distance from the *one* thought of God, self-subsistent, all-sufficing. We end as we began, with the profoundly subject thought of God which we hope will fill the last instant of our dying life.

"Sanctus Fortis, Sanctus Deus,
De profundis oro te."

"Praise to the Holiest in the height,
And in the depth be praise."

"Lord, Thou hast been our Refuge: from one generation to another."

P. N. Waggett.

THE IMPORTANCE AND JUSTIFICATION OF A BELIEF IN A PERSONAL DEVIL

In searching about for a title to describe this paper, I was struck at the outset by certain rather curious associations surrounding the subject which made it difficult to adopt the right tone in treating of it. I intended first of all to call it simply "The Devil," but I had no sooner pictured these two simple words on the society's card, than I saw that it would not do. When I asked myself "Why not?" the answer seemed to be that so curt a title might seem rather comic, and rather shocking and comic just because it was shocking. I suppose that, in the whole range of religious subjects, there is no other the statement

of which would immediately raise a smile. It is perfectly true that Religion is naturally and rightly a great field for humour, for (if humour is seeing the difference between things) there is no difference so profound as that between things spiritual and things earthly, or, again, between the professions of religious people and their practice. Nothing is more easy than to raise a laugh by transposing (for instance) the surroundings and habits of earth to heaven (to take a non-religious example, who can read without a smile, in supposed revelations from the other world, such details as "Everything is so well fitted-up over here; we have baths, hot and cold"?): again, how charmingly natural is the unconscious lapse to ordinary levels of thinking (while using religious formulæ all the time) in the case of the preacher who said, "I have had no time to prepare my sermon, and so I shall have to rely on the Grace of God: next Sunday I hope to come better prepared." Humour rightly used in religion has nothing to do with irreverence. But such contrasts depend for their flavour on man's poor efforts to persuade himself that he is at home in a world where he can hardly breathe the air. Nothing of the kind applies to the Devil. Why, then, should his very name be amusing apart from all relations to us? There is nothing funny about angels *per se;* there is nothing funny about evil spirits; even the name Satan is rather impressive than amusing.

The answer, I suppose, is roughly that the world, having lived for a long time in a genuine fear of the Prince of Darkness (as is terribly shown by the History of Witchcraft), has taken its revenge on him, now that many of the causes for fear have been shown to be mere superstitions, by treating him as a joke. Because he has been unduly fearful, he has become by reaction unduly farcical. At many periods one can see a tendency to treat him as a joke. The mediæval sculptors loved to indulge their sense of the grotesque by covering the outside of their churches with half-humorous demons, and in the Miracle Plays he furnished the comic relief side by side with Mrs. Noah. This, I suppose, is due to the natural tendency to play with things that are terrible, and is illustrated by the pleasure we find in jests about death and murder (*cf.* De Quincey's famous essay). Luther taught that the Devil was best conquered by contempt and ridicule, and quotes with approval the story of a lawyer who had annoyed the Devil by some remarks he had made in a church court. That night Satan appeared by his bed and gazed sternly and fixedly at him, his eyes glowing like coals. The lawyer returned his stare unabashed for some time, and then, as nothing further happened, said: "Well, if you have nothing better to do, I have"

and turning over, went to sleep again. One may remark here that it requires more courage and is also more really humorous to believe in the Devil and yet to laugh at him than to crack easy jokes about a Spirit of Evil in whom one does not believe.

The fear of the Devil having been cast out, his comic side only remained, and this accounts, I suppose, for the curious mixture of amusement and fear with which we greet his name. The fear is made up of all kinds of inherited instincts, legends, and fireside stories deep down in our subconscious selves, which we take a half-shivering delight in disbelieving, as we laugh and shudder in the full light of day over some ghost-story that seemed more serious when told at midnight.

I said above that the Devil had become unduly farcical because he had been unduly fearful. For this fearfulness, both the theologians and the popular mind are to blame. The theologians overdressed the Devil for the part of chief tormentor in the drama of eternal punishment. They tended also to see devils everywhere. Bishop Hall (died 1656) says: "How formidable is the number of these evil and hostile spirits! Had we the eyes of holy hermits, we might see the air full of these malignant spirits, laying snares for miserable mankind, and if the possessors of one poor demoniac could style themselves Legion, a name that in the truest account contains no less than 10 cohorts and every cohort 15 companies, and every company 25 soldiers, to the number of 1,225, what an army of these hellish fiends do we suppose is that, wherewith whole mankind is beleaguered, all the world over!"

The Devil not only lost much of his credibility by the over-zealousness of those who believed in him; he also lost his dignity by becoming too popular. The country is covered with Devil's Dykes; many are the churches which he tried to prevent being built, and the bridges which he only allowed on condition that the first living creature to pass over should belong to him. (The inhabitants always cheated him by sending over a cat.) It is the penalty paid by an over-emphasized theology that the popular mind distorts it and makes it ludicrous. The hell of the theologians was simply repulsive; the hell of the people, with its flames and devils with pitchforks, was ridiculous. So the Devil of the theologians was a nightmare; the popular devil with horns and hoofs became a farce.

The state of scepticism, on the subject, in the last century (due, of course, also to materialism and a weakened sense of the supernatural) is well represented by the judgment of Lord Westbury, who "dismissed Hell with costs." The accused (a churchwarden, I think) was charged with heresy for not believing in a personal Devil. He was acquitted, but it is said

he changed his views on being presented with his lawyer's bill. This reaction has spent its strength. Materialism is no longer the fashion; if it still haunts men's consciences, it is less on their lips; for good or for evil, Spiritualism has widened the horizon of the ordinary person, and Spiritualism is itself largely the result of the close contact with death during the War and the passionate desire to solve a problem, so constantly and so tragically presented to so many people. The days are passed when people kept up their spirits by laughing at a devil they believed in; the days are passed when people kept up their reputation for wit by laughing at a devil they did not believe in. Behind all these human accretions, interesting and entertaining as they are, we begin to see again the lines of the original figure of man's adversary, mysterious, half-fascinating in his untiring malice and endless resourcefulness. Our generation, called so strikingly to face the fact and the problem of evil, can weigh seriously and soberly the motives that induced the religious mind, during so long a period, to see behind the forces of evil the rule and guidance of some Spirit of Darkness.

Before we enter on our discussion proper, I should like to quote as an introduction one of the few passages in which a philosopher (not a theologian) notices the doctrine of the Devil. Spinoza, in chapter v. of his *Short Treatise*, says: "If the Devil is a thing entirely and absolutely contrary to God, having in him nothing of God, then he is exactly the same as nothing. Let us suppose, then, as certain people do, that he is a thinking person, who neither wills nor does, anything that is good and thus opposes God in everything.

"He is, then, very miserable and if prayers can help him, it would be right to pray for his conversion. . . . Let us consider, however, whether a Being so miserable could exist for a single instant. We shall find, at once, that it is impossible, since the fact that a thing endures comes from its perfection, and the more it has of essence and God-likeness, the more it *is*. How then, I ask, could the Devil *be*, if he has not the smallest perfection? If we add that the being or enduring of every thinking thing is caused only by the union of that thing with God, a union produced by love, while, in devils, we must suppose the opposite of this union, it is clearly impossible that they exist. But if there is not the least necessity to admit the existence of devils, why should we admit it? We have not the same reason as others have to admit their existence in order to find causes for hate, envy, anger and other passions of the same kind." (Spinoza means, because he has shown, in the preceding chapters that such passions proceed from the movements of our own minds.)

I may remark in passing that the validity of this line of reasoning depends on the pantheistic tendency so strong in Spinoza to believe that all reality is caused by God and expresses His Nature, from which it seems to follow that all evil is unreal. It is therefore as difficult for him—or perhaps I should say almost as difficult—to believe in evil men as in evil spirits. Again, does it really follow that because it is better for a thing to exist than not to exist, therefore the extreme of evil is non-existence, and the Devil reduces himself by definition to nothing? It seems absurd to say that the world is worse if there is no devil than if there is one, and, of course, Spinoza does not mean this. This raises the question whether existence, like force and power, is not a neutral thing, which if turned against the good, becomes all the more vile, because it was meant to help the good. "Corruptio optimi pessima."

We return to the general discussion.

The two classes of arguments for the existence of a personal Devil, like the arguments for the existence of God, with which it is instructive to compare them, fall into two classes—the a priori and the a posteriori—that is to say, the arguments that from the general nature of the universe makes his existence probable and the arguments from actual experience which might be held to make his existence a verifiable fact.

The first a priori argument is, of course, that his existence explains—or makes it a little less difficult to explain—the problem of Evil. Just as the marks of good in the world (Design, Goodness, etc.) help us to believe in God, so it might be urged that the elements of ugliness and wickedness, as positive, as real, as purposive, imply a spiritual and personal Devil. If the lark seems, as it sings, to be praising its Maker, the same bird, if we find it starved on the ground, through an accident, seems a sacrifice to some malicious fiend.

Such a dualism is very natural to the human mind, and there is no doubt that Persia (the home of the dualistic system of Manichee) influenced the development of the doctrine of Satan. Scott's fine hymn to Ahriman in the *Talisman* gives expression to this tendency.

"Dark Ahriman, whom Irak still
Holds origin of woe and ill,
When bending at thy shrine
We view the world with troubled eye;
Where see we 'neath th' extended sky
An empire matching thine?

"If the Benigner Power can yield
A fountain in the desert field
Where weary pilgrims drink,
Thine are the waves that lash the rock,
Thine the tornado's deadly shock
Where countless navies sink.

* * * * *

> " Thus, from the moment of our birth,
> Long as we linger on the earth
> Thou rul'st the fate of men;
> Thine are the pangs of life's last hour,
> And—who dare answer ?—is thy power,
> Dark Spirit, ended then ?"

This conception of a great rival power, co-equal with, and possibly victorious against, God cannot be, formally at least, introduced into any religion that calls itself monotheistic, and it colours Christian legend rather than Christian doctrine. The view inherited by the Church from Judaism and summarized in the Book of Wisdom, " By the envy of the Devil came death into the world," ascribes the origin of evil to the revolt of a Power or Powers, infinitely more exalted and more richly endowed than man, but all the same creatures like him. I think that very often justice is hardly done to this doctrine as a theory of the Fall. It is usual for philosophers to deal very haughtily with such an idea, to content themselves with pointing out that the question of the origin of evil is thereby only pushed one stage further back. If Adam shares the credit with Satan, we have to ask how or by whom Lucifer, son of the morning, was drawn aside to fall from heaven. It is true, of course, that the problem how in a creature, fashioned by an all-perfect God, evil was allowed to break out and assume such appalling dimensions remains equally a difficulty whether the first rebel were a man or an angel. But there are other difficulties besetting the doctrine of the Fall, which bear on its nature rather than on its origin.

By the doctrine of the Fall, I do not refer to any particular histories or characters; I take it in its broadest sense as the view that the history of the world has not followed the course that God willed; that God, in the world's evolution, has had to reckon with opposition. Now, if this is so, it seems hard to believe that the universe has not somehow been spoiled, far beyond the reach of man's responsibility and power. Nature is not simply " red in tooth and claw," but there are enough elements of cruelty and waste and ugliness in it (apart from man) to make it plausible to hold that something has gone wrong with it even more fundamental than man's apostasy. Again, the tremendous effects of man's fall, seemingly so unjust, the way in which the powers of evil once let loose, gained so startling a momentum, seem to me to favour the view that man, by his sin, put himself under the guidance of an evil will, more cunning and more powerful than himself. In the words of Our Lord's parable, " I sowed good seed in my field; whence then hath it tares ?" " An enemy hath done this."

It may be objected, " Why did God permit the Devil to have

such power? It may be imagined that man, though sinful, was allowed to continue in sin, because of the hope of his redemption, but are we to suppose that the Devil is allowed to hold power with a view to his possible redemption?" I admit that here we are face to face with an insoluble mystery. But the facts are there. God took the risk of letting man choose, knowing the consequence of wrong choice, and that He should have allowed those terrible and far-reaching consequences is equally a fact, whether we call in a Devil to account for those consequences or not.

The second argument, a priori, for the existence of a Devil, is rather different and needs very careful handling. It rests on the conception of a scale of Being. Without committing myself to the view of Aquinas that there is a continuous ladder of creatures, up from animals through man to spirits or angels with ever increasing powers and capacities, I may say, at least, that it is a very natural tendency of the human mind to think that there are creatures in the universe, other than those he sees, that God's creative purpose is not exhausted in this planet, and that the entire universe does not revolve round man as its centre, morally any more than it does physically. If there are spirits above man, also endowed with freedom, it is natural again to believe that some are good and some are fallen, and that the fallen spirits are more terrible and wicked because of the greater height from which they are fallen.

I said this argument must be used with caution. We must beware of the tendency to think of Reality as a scale with two definite ends. This is to take a metaphor too seriously. St. Anselm's famous argument, in the form in which he put it, suggests the idea that, at one end of the scale, there must be "that than which nothing greater can be conceived," but of course, if we press an impossible picture too far, such a being would not be God, but a very superior angel, just as the best conceivable book would be a book alongside of the other books. So we must not think of the Devil as at the other end of the scale "that than which nothing worse can be conceived." Such a conception is equally self-contradictory. Just as a perfect God must not be the flower at the top of a universe, but a Spirit living in all and controlling all, so a perfect Devil would be a person who had unlimited scope in a world given over to his power. Again, if we think of a band of devils obeying a Prince of Darkness, we have to grant them the virtues of discipline ("Devil with devil damned firm concord holds"), and to their leader a certain courage and daring which do actually half-redeem Milton's Satan.

I would not say positively that the conception of an

absolutely bad chief of Devils is impossible. I content myself with pointing out that, according to Christian theology, God could not have created any such being. Therefore he must be regarded as a fallen Spirit. He was once a "son of the morning," and was, I suppose, for a time the servant of God, and therefore not so absolutely bad as if he had never had those days of heaven behind him.*

If it is asked, "Can the Devil repent, then?" I think it is sufficient to reply with the Scotch peasant, "It wad be cruel to gar him repent. It wad be ower sair upon him. Better kill him. The bitterness of sic repentance wad be ower terrible. It wad be mair nor he cud bide. It wad break his hert a'tegither."

Hitherto, I have been asking only whether the traditional conception of the Devil is nonsense or not, and I have suggested that it is possible, without ceasing to be rational, to hold that part of the evil in the world is due to the malice and craft of fallen spirits. We have now to ask, Is there any evidence to suggest that evil spirits *do* actually exist? Does experience offer facts that make such a theory tenable? Here, also, I shall be content with suggesting one or two possibilities; I do not think we know nearly enough to talk dogmatically.

First, then, the experience of temptation, always the most fertile source of belief in a Tempter. Here most divers answers are given by people of different temperaments. St. James says that a man is tempted when he is drawn aside by his lusts, though his well-known reference to the shuddering devils shows that he was no sceptic as to their existence. Many have echoed George Meredith's sentiment, "We are betrayed by what is false within." It has even been suggested that the Devil was invented to relieve man of responsibility for his worst faults, as Eve threw the blame on the serpent. (That this is not always the way of human nature is illustrated by the story of the child, who when told that Satan had incited her to steal the jam and to spit at her nurse, admitted the Devil as a partner in her theft, but added with pride, "I thought of the spitting myself.")

Others—I suppose the majority of religious people at all times—have found in temptation "a force, not themselves, that makes for unrighteousness" (to adapt Matthew Arnold's definition of God); the "strange, bewildering thoughts" that beset the holiest people at prayer, the hateful suggestions that

* I may be criticized out of my own mouth. "Corruptio optimi pessima." But I am not here discussing or trying to assess the exact moral guilt involved in the devil's sin, only the metaphysical possibility, so to speak, of a being always bad from the beginning.

intrude, uninvited and undesired, have seemed to them the work of a hostile power. Forbes Robinson said that nothing but the spite of a personal Devil could keep two souls apart. To others the extraordinary effectiveness of evil, so far beyond the will and intention of the persons who commit evil, has pointed the same way. It was said of the second year of the war that the conduct of the campaign seemed to have passed out of the hands of the Governments involved into the personal management of the Devil.

The phenomena of possession seem to present these aspects of temptation in an intenser degree. The whole self seems absorbed by an alien personality, sometimes by several. Psychology is grappling with these facts. It is possible for a person to wake up one morning and find himself totally different, having lost all touch with his past self. Such instances are not necessarily evil; the second self need not be worse than the first. Whence these new selves come, we cannot, at present, say. They may emerge from what we vaguely call "the depths of the subconscious." They may be also stimulated from outside, and as we believe that the new self "created after God" in true holiness is formed by Grace, so nothing forbids us to believe that there may be a dreadful opposite to Grace, whereby the powers of evil possess those who surrender themselves to them. The Devil, as well as God, may act on the subconscious self. Till we know more about what underlies consciousness and "how far down" its roots reach, there is nothing particularly rash in holding—what so many earnest men have said they experienced—that the soul can lay itself open to more than human influences of evil.

Of the evidence furnished by Spiritualism I am not competent to speak. The Roman communion encourages the belief that these phenomena are due to devils, and points to the moral deterioration of the medium in so many cases. I should only wish to say this—the difficulty of proving that the communications come from the departed spirits of men and women (the ordinary spiritualist contention) is great enough. It is notoriously hard to produce a fact which conclusively shows that any message could not have come by telepathy, being read by the medium in some human mind, or possibly from some thought broadcasted, as it were, by the man or woman, when alive, perhaps, on their deathbeds, and picked up by the medium. To prove that the spirits are non-human is harder still; the effects might be produced by the evil wills of departed human spirits. It would have to be shown, I suppose, either that these effects were more persistently evil than any human spirit would be likely to cause, or else that they indicated superhuman power

or knowledge. I think it is fair to say that nobody who had not other reasons for believing in devils would be led to believe in them by Spiritualism alone.

Three main arguments are generally brought forward against the belief in evil spirits.

The first is that it tends to create an atmosphere of fear and nervousness, unworthy of "the glorious liberty of the children of God." Bishop Colenso says: "Shake off the incubus of that traditional system of religious belief which prevents our standing up upon our feet, as men breathing joyously the health-giving air, the fresh inspiring life of this our day, rejoicing in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free." But this is not all the truth. Two things must be remembered on the other side.

First, that if human experience, especially religious experience, is true, life does contain terrible facts, great risks of loss as well as great hopes of gain. Fear is, after all, but the reverse side of Hope. As the goal of our high calling appears more infinitely desirable, so more infinitely unbearable is the thought of being "a castaway." Religions of "healthy-mindedness" have not always been conspicuous for facing facts. Our Lord Himself, whether He was referring to God or the Devil, said: "I will tell you whom you are to fear."

Secondly, to many, conflict with a personal Power of Evil has seemed to give an edge to the spiritual life, a spice of danger and adventurousness, that calls out the best instincts of the warrior. St. Paul's great saying sounds the trumpet-call to battle and has no touch of "the spirit of bondage" when he says "our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers." Browning, in his "Prospice" has wonderfully caught this note:

> "Fear Death? to feel the fog in the throat,
> The mist in my face,
> When the snows begin and the blasts denote
> I am nearing the place
> The power of the night, the press of the storm
> The post of the foe
> Where he stands, the Arch-Fear in visible form,
> . . . Yet the strong man must go. . . .
> . . . .
> I was ever a fighter, so one fight more,
> The best and the last."

Notice here how the poetic feeling is heightened by the personification of the foe to be faced.

The second objection is that belief in devils clouds the beauty and excellence of God's Creation. To this it can only be answered that no one wants to invent possibilities of evil, or to make the universe appear worse than it is. It is simply a

question whether a group of facts, admitted and palpable, are to be explained solely by man's perversity or by a superhuman power. This belief only becomes superstition if we hold that any part of God's Creation is in necessary or hopeless bondage to the powers of darkness. But Christianity teaches, or should teach, that the devils have no power over us without our consent and that, even when that is once given, there is liberation through Christ. The early Christians, who are charged with believing in a cruel and repulsive theory of possession, were also the very people who believed that they had power to cast demons out, and St. Paul, if he speaks of "the prince of this world-darkness," also declares that all creation is "travailing" together to win adoption and redemption.

Lastly, it is said (as we saw above) that man's sense of responsibility is weakened if there is a Devil on whom he can cast the blame for his sins. This view has hardly been borne out by the facts. It is not true that the decay of belief in a Tempter has gone hand in hand with a deepened sense of sin. It would be truer to say of our time that a disbelief in the Devil and a disbelief in the gravity of sin are both characteristic of it. So it has been said, "The Devil never did a better stroke of business than when he persuaded people he did not exist." I would not myself go so far as to say that belief in a devil makes a man's sense of sin more real. The converse, I think, is more true that, when people come to a more profound sense of what sin is, they are more inclined to believe in a personal Devil as possible.

Looking back on my paper, with a view to summing up, I feel less inclined than ever to conclude with a dogmatic assertion. I do not think that belief in a Devil can be dismissed as childish or absurd. On the contrary, I think it is a hypothesis which throws a little light on facts otherwise very dark for us. But I do not feel myself that it is, like belief in God, necessary to make sense of the spiritual life, which would not, perhaps, be appreciably poorer or less significant if belief in a Devil were abandoned.

F. H. Brabant.

ADVERSARIA EXEGETICA

"But after that I am risen, I will go before you into Galilee."
"ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν."
Mark xiv. 28.

The commentators leave this saying unexplained. But it cries out for interpretation. St. Luke boldly omits it. At first reading St. Matthew appears to find its fulfilment in the appearance of the risen Lord to the eleven on the mountain in

Galilee. St. John inserts the discourses which immediately precede the Betrayal as a commentary on this saying;* but he has substituted for "Galilee" heaven, in so far as the passage refers to the journey of Jesus, and the world, in so far as it refers to the journey of the disciples. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus "goes before" his disciples to the Father, but the disciples are sent out into the world to go and bear fruit, the phrase being picked up again in different imagery when the disciples "go a fishing," and, guided by the Lord himself, make the great catch of fish, who are really men. The "Galilee" of the original saying is only recovered with an effort in the opening of the final chapter, "after these things Jesus showed himself again to the disciples at the sea of Tiberias."

And yet the words, as recorded by St. Mark, remain firmly embedded in the tradition of the Passion; and it is clearly of importance in any reconstruction of the meaning of our Lord's teaching that an attempt should be made to discover whether St. John is playing with the words, without any regard for their historical significance, or whether he is in point of fact interpreting their meaning correctly—whether, that is, he is allowing the later history of Christianity to give a fantastic interpretation to a saying of Jesus or whether the mission of the disciples had led him to comment correctly on a mysterious saying of Jesus preserved with some difficulty within Christian tradition.

This mysterious and oracular saying holds an important position in the Marcan narrative; it follows the account of the institution of the sacrificial meal of the new covenant and precedes the account of the agony in the garden and of the coming of Judas Iscariot. Its position alone suggests some peculiar significance, and this is supported by the fact that the phrase recalls and reverses the descriptive words with which the Passion narrative is introduced: "And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus *went before them*:† and they were amazed; and as they followed, they were afraid. And he took again the twelve, and began to tell them what things should happen unto him, saying, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles: and they shall mock him, and shall scourge him, and shall spit upon him, and shall kill him: and the third day he shall rise again" (Mark x. 32-34).

* Echoes of Mark xiv. 26–28, occur in John xiii. 36, xvi. 1, 32*f.* xviii. 1; *Cf.* also Mark xiv. 42; John xiv. 31.

† Mark x. 32: ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ἦν προάγων αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

In this passage Jesus is described as going before his disciples, leading them, dragging them after him, to Jerusalem, that they may witness and, to some extent at least, share in the humiliation of the Son of man, who is the Messiah; this humiliation of the Messiah is, however, nothing less than his rejection by the Jews, which carries with it the end of Judaism and the destruction of the Temple. The prophecy of the things "which should happen unto the Son of man" ends with the words, "and the third day he shall rise again," only to be picked up and completed later in the words, "But after I am risen, I will go before you into Galilee." This passage, however, does not only complete the prophecy, it also reverses the description of the road to the cross.

The two passages may therefore be paraphrased: The Son of man led his disciples to Jerusalem in order that they might witness the rejection of the Messiah and his crucifixion by the chief priests—in fact, in order that they might see the end of the old covenant; and he promised that he would rise again and lead them, perhaps still against their will, out of the doomed city of fossilized and now superseded Jehovah worship —into Galilee.

"Galilee," then, is the problem. What an anti-climax it all is! The death of the Messiah, the end of Judaism, the resurrection of the Son of man and—his retirement into Galilee.

It is not surprising that, when St. Mark repeats the saying, placing it in the mouth of the angel who sat at the door of the empty tomb, he should change its meaning by adding the words, "There ye shall see him, as he said unto you." The comment on this addition must be that it is not what Jesus had said. St. Mark does bravely get a meaning out of "Galilee" by making it the scene of an appearance of the risen Lord, and we must presume that the end of St. Mark's Gospel contained originally an account of an appearance in Galilee which fulfilled the words of the angel, and, as St. Mark understood them, also the words of Jesus. The difficulty is that though the words "I will lead you forth into Galilee" may rightly be regarded as being partially fulfilled by an appearance in Galilee, they make no definite reference to such an event, their natural meaning being that some great work of the Messiah and his disciples is foretold which is to follow the rejection at Jerusalem, and which is dependent upon the crucifixion and the resurrection of the Son of man.

St. Luke omits the saying. After telling how Jesus and his disciples left the upper room to go to the Mount of Olives, he passes immediately to the narrative of the agony in the garden. Having made this omission, he is bound also to alter the words

of the angel, and here he betrays his knowledge of the saying. For St. Mark's "He is risen; he is not here; behold the place where they laid him. But go your way, tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you *into Galilee:* there shall ye see him, as he said unto you," St. Luke has "He is not here but is risen: remember how he spake unto you *when he was yet in Galilee*, saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men and be crucified and the third day rise again." With what very great skill has he removed the objectionable word "Galilee," and rendered it harmless!

The usual explanation of this is that St. Luke knows nothing of Galilean appearances, and for this reason omits the saying. But in its original form the saying does not refer to appearances, therefore St. Luke's difficulty does not lie in his supposed ignorance of Galilean appearances. The difficulty is that after the resurrection, the Lord did not return to Galilee, but ascended to the right hand of the Father; nor did the disciples return to Galilee; but, led by the ascended Lord, they went forth into the world preaching the Gospel and converting the Gentiles. "Thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things" (Luke xxiv. 46, 47). St. Luke, seeing clearly that the mission of the disciples is the climax of the Lord's work, and, understanding literally the Galilee of the traditional words of Jesus, has no alternative but to omit them. At the same time, he is confident that he is correctly interpreting the Gospel of Jesus, and that the Lord himself foretold the apostolic mission to the world after his death and resurrection. Summing up the argument thus far, it is clear that the words "after that I am risen, I will go before you into Galilee," presented great difficulties both to St. Mark and to St. Luke. The former evangelist interprets them as foretelling an appearance in Galilee, and in so doing fails to give the words their natural meaning; the latter, taking them to involve a retirement into Galilee, regards this as contradicting other words of Jesus and as unintelligible in the light of later history; he therefore omits them. Neither procedure is really satisfactory, for the saying remains obstinately embedded in the tradition, as both evangelists seem very well aware. Is any other interpretation possible?

At first sight St. Matthew goes the way of St. Mark. He adopts the words of the angel as St. Mark had recorded them, with the addition, "there shall ye see him," and we are led to expect merely the narrative of an appearance in Galilee. But the appearance St. Matthew records is far more than an appear-

ance. The reader's interest is centred not so much in the fact of an appearance, as in the words spoken by the risen Lord. "Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." The resurrection involves the unlimited authority of Jesus, this involves the mission of his disciples to the world, and in this mission he is always present with them. Is it pressing the words to say, that he *leads them forth* to evangelize the world? The appearance in Galilee is, then, for St. Matthew of prime importance, because it formed the authoritative starting-point of the mission to the Gentiles. The words "I will go before you into Galilee" can almost be said to imply: "I will lead you into the world of the Gentiles." Fortunately, there is a very significant parallel passage at the beginning of St. Matthew's Gospel which lends support to this implication. After the narrative of the Temptation, St. Matthew follows St. Mark with the note that when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison he departed (retired) into Galilee. To this he adds a comment which shows that he attached very great importance to this retirement. "Leaving Nazareth he came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is upon the sea coast, in the borders of Zabulon and Nephthalim: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, The land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, *Galilee of the Gentiles:* the people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up" (Mark. i. 14; Matt. iv. 12-16). The movement of Jesus into Galilee was regarded by St. Matthew as a fulfilment of Isaiah ix. 2. But if this detail in the life of Jesus was so significant, what of the journey of the risen Christ into Galilee! That surely was far more significant. From the conclusion of St. Matthew's Gospel the editor seems to have felt this, and ends his Gospel not with the mere record of an appearance in Galilee, but with the words which authorize the mission to all the nations of the world, and which assure the disciples of the presence with them of the risen and now all-powerful Jesus.

St. Matthew, without definitely interpreting the saying "I will go before you into Galilee" as meaning "I will lead you forth in the mission to the world," does at any rate leave the way open to such an interpretation. The importance of St. Matthew's Gospel for our present purpose does not lie

in the interpretation which its author put upon the Galilee saying, but in the fact that he reminds the readers of his Gospel of the phrase "Galilee of the Gentiles." This phrase is not a suitable invention of St. Matthew in order to give greater significance to our Lord's journey to Capernaum; it forms an element in Isaiah's prophecy of the coming of the great Messianic ruler (ix. 6, 7), the great light of whose rule is to shine upon the people that walked in darkness, even in Galilee of the Gentiles.

Being now within sight of a solution of the problem of the Galilee of our Lord's saying, we must return to the Marcan narrative.

St. Mark has preserved the tradition of certain words spoken by Jesus to his disciples before his betrayal. He told them that the Son of Man was as a man going on a *far journey* (Mark xiii. 34); he told them that he must be delivered up to the chief priests, who would condemn him to death and kill him, but on the third day he would rise again and lead them into Galilee.

The commentators who take "Galilee" literally make no sense of the words taken as a whole. From Jerusalem to Galilee is not a "far journey," nor does Jesus say "I will *return* to Galilee." If the words are to have any meaning at all the journey to Galilee must contain the suggestion of some climax, which makes the Passion and the Crucifixion intelligible as means to some great end. Neither can the passage be satisfactorily explained by finding in it a prophecy of his appearance in Galilee. Radical commentators find an easy solution to the whole problem by asserting that the prophecies of our Lord's death and resurrection are additions to the narrative made by the evangelists, who thus gain the authority of Jesus himself for the faith of primitive Christianity. But this solution breaks on the Galilee saying, for had they invented this, they invented a saying which St. Matthew and St. Mark find difficulty in explaining and which St. Luke is compelled to omit.

For these reasons we are driven, first to accept the historicity of these sayings, and, secondly, to discard the literal interpretation of the Galilee saying as giving no adequate meaning. There appears, therefore, no alternative left but to interpret Galilee from the Isaiah passage, and to draw the conclusion that our Lord proclaimed his resurrection as leading to the establishment of the new covenant in which the sovereignty of God and his kingdom would be extended to include the Gentiles, thus fulfilling the prophetic visions of the Messianic kingdom not by gathering the nations to Jerusalem, but by the risen Messiah and his apostles going forth to the Gentiles.

This interpretation will be greatly strengthened if it can be

shown that the words and actions of our Lord during the days immediately preceding the Crucifixion, and which, in fact, led to it, were conditioned by his conscious desire to fulfil Old Testament prophecy, and if it can be shown also from other passages that the extension of his mission to the Gentiles formed an element in his teaching.

The Marcan account of the Passion includes the narrative of the entry into Jerusalem, the appearance in the Temple, the parable of the wicked husbandmen, the interpretation of the Messianic title Son of David, the eschatological speech in which the destruction of the Temple is foretold and the coming of the Son of man in glory, the words of institution in which the crucifixion is interpreted as the blood of the (new) covenant, and the only words recorded as spoken from the cross are " My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" These actions and the words which accompany them all fulfil Old Testament prophecy. The entry into Jerusalem fulfils Zechariah ix. 9; the appearance in the Temple, Malachi iii. 1. The Messiah is shown to be David's Lord from Psalm cx. 1; the eschatological speech contains reminiscences from Daniel, Joel, and Zephaniah. The words of institution presume that the new covenant foretold by Jeremiah xxxi. 31 *ff.* is at hand, and the word from the cross is a quotation from Psalm xxii. In fact, the continuity of the narrative is conditioned by the saying: " the Son of man indeed goeth, *as it is written of him* " (Mark xiv. 21), and this is not a comment by St. Mark, but a word of Jesus.*

Unless we are to regard the whole narrative of the Passion as mythical, the only conclusion which it is possible to draw from the evidence is that our Lord during the last week acted and spoke as the Christ of prophecy. It is, then, not unreasonable to find in the saying " I will go before you into Galilee " a reminiscence of some passage in the Old Testament, especially since these words follow immediately the quotation from Zechariah xiii. 7, " I will smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered."

The connection between the death of the shepherd and the scattering of the sheep, which stands in the text as a closely parallel phrase to the " after that I am risen, I will go before you into Galilee," makes it necessary to question the interpretation of the scattering of the sheep as referring only to the flight of the disciples after the Betrayal. St. John seems to suggest that both the desertion of Jesus and the mission to the world are involved in the scattering of the disciples: " Behold the hour cometh, yea, is now come that ye shall be scattered

* *Cf.* Mark xiv. 49.

every man to his own, and shall leave me alone: and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me. These things I have spoken unto you that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world" (John xvi. 32, 33). A decision as to whether this exegesis be correct or not will depend largely upon whether the mission to the Gentiles formed a part of Jewish Messianic expectation, and upon whether the recorded words of Jesus include reference to such a mission. There is room for a nice piece of work to be done on the place of the Gentiles in the Messianic hopes of the Jews, but there is not space to attempt it here. It must not be forgotten, however, that the second Psalm contains the passage: "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession," and that the account of the Baptism with which St. Mark opens his Gospel recalls this passage.

The passages in which our Lord refers to the mission to the Gentiles are more directly pertinent. The eschatological speech recorded in the thirteenth chapter of St. Mark's Gospel contains a passage of prime importance. The chief apostles are told that they must stand before governors and kings "for my sake" for a witness to them, and that, before the final coming of the Son of man, the "Gospel must first be preached to all nations" (Mark xiii. 9, 10). They are also told that at the final coming the Son of Man will send his angels, and will "gather his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost parts of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven" (Mark xiii. 27); presumably this refers to the Gentiles converted by the preaching of the apostles. It is impossible without doing violence to the text to regard this passage as an insertion, and it is far too closely connected with our Lord's teaching in other places to be dismissed as a Jewish Apocalypse. The death of the Son of man is to be followed by the apostolic mission to the world in the power of the Spirit, but it is to be no easy triumphant progress; the fate of the Son of man among the Jews will also be the fate of his disciples among the Gentiles, but those who endure to the end shall be saved. The contrast between his own mission to the Jews and the mission to the Gentiles which is to follow gives point to the words addressed to the Syrophenician woman: "Let the children *first* be filled." The woman was, as it were, born out of due time; also the command that the action of the woman in the house of Simon the leper should be remembered "wherever this Gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world" presumes that a world-wide mission is to follow the death of the Messiah. To these

passages may be added the sayings incorporated by St. Matthew in the sermon addressed to the disciples on the mountain: "Ye are the salt of the earth"; "ye are the light of the world"; "let your light shine before men"; and also the parables of the seed growing secretly and of the mustard seed in which attention is drawn to the mysterious and hidden origin of the Kingdom of God and its open and visible growth; these valid and mysterious sayings are not unconnected with the words spoken later in the Gospel in which Jesus tells his disciples that the Son of man must die and rise again, and on which St. Mark comments: "he spake the Word (*i.e.*, the Gospel) openly."

From these scattered remnants of the words of Jesus it is possible to reconstruct the background from which they spring, and which alone makes them coherent. The humiliation of the Son of man among the Jews and his Messianic mission to them must issue in his death, which is the formal rejection of the Messiah and of the Kingdom of God by the people of Israel. This will be followed by his resurrection and the mission of his disciples to the world. Only when this is completed will the end come and the Son of man return on the clouds as Daniel prophetically saw him coming. On this background the sayings preserved by St. Mark become intelligible. "It is written, I will smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered. But after that I am risen, I will go before you into Galilee."

The exegesis to which we have been driven serves to remind us that the detailed and acute interpretation of isolated passages from the Old Testament, which we are accustomed to associate with St. Paul and the editor of St. Matthew's Gospel, goes back, in fact, to our Lord himself. This was well expressed by a theologian, now far too little read, when he wrote: "Christ had an eye for overlooked texts, a mind that could appreciate forgotten or neglected truths, a spiritual insight that could discern the undercurrents of prophetic thought. Withal he was a most original interpreter; this we must ever remember if we would understand his teaching. He was, to an inestimable extent, original in every way. He was original as a thinker and actor, not the mere creature of historical development. He was likewise original as an exegete and as a fulfiller of Scripture."*

E. C. Hoskyns.

* A. B. Bruce: *The Kingdom of God*, pp. 48, 49.

THE CONDITION AND NEEDS OF ENGLAND

1. The present spiritual condition of England need not be described here. As it is quite sufficiently well known, there is nothing really to discuss. But there is some room for an analysis of its nature and causes. Only where we have a clear perception of exactly what is wrong with us can we know what aggravates the disease, and in what direction we can look for a remedy.

As I could not attempt anything like a complete diagnosis of a condition so complex, I must confine myself to certain main features, with which we are all immediately concerned. That some analysis is needed seems evident if we consider the two explanations most frequently given as adequate.

2. (i.) "We clergy are very conscious of our failings as a class (which is rather apt to mean the failings of other clergy.) We know the laity are dependent on us, and the real cause of religious decay is the lack of earnestness in the clergy themselves."

But (*a*) what does this explanation amount to? No doubt saints can work miracles (*i.e.*, some can), and if we could get saints for all parishes, they might produce a reformation. But again, a Church capable of producing saints on this scale would hardly need reforming. I do not think God works that way. Dealing with actualities, is this explanation valid? So far as my memory goes, the town clergy, at least, are far more in earnest than they were fifty years ago, yet there are fewer people in church. Is the explanation even true? No doubt we might be much better than we are, but I venture to assert that the apparent lack of earnestness—which I do not deny—is not a cause but a result of failure. It is, in short, discouragement. If so, let us subnote it as a significant fact in our analysis.

(*b*) This reference to the failings of the clergy involves, rests upon, the common assumption given that the laity are dependent upon their clergy. Certainly the *parishes* are to a most alarming extent. Only a very forceful personality can make a parish live. When he is followed by a merely average priest, everything falls flat. But what a confession! The Gospel, the Church, the Sacraments, have ceased to appeal, though a really devoted priest may get them through while he is there. Surely, this explains nothing, but it is a most extraordinary revelation of where we have actually got to.

3. (ii.) It is perhaps even more common to throw the

charge on to the laity, and to put everything down to "the growing indifference of the day."

4. This last, of course, hardly professes to be an explanation, but the habit of taking a mere description as if it were an explanation has a very bad effect on our minds. It suggests a too easy impatience at the mere idea that there is anything more to do or say than what we have done and said, except to do it bigger, and to say it louder. If people will not listen to the church bell, let us try a brass band.

One of the greatest of all human weaknesses is our habit of looking for enemies and dangers everywhere except where they are—viz., in ourselves. Europe is being torn in pieces by it at this moment. Yet Germany was not ruined by the Entente; it was ruined by Germans. And again, not by want of patriotism in her people, but by the false Germanism of her patriots. For ourselves, therefore, it is not the feebleness with which we pursue our ends, but the ends themselves which we need to reconsider. I do not mean our final end, which is the love and service of God, but the immediatc end we are pressing for, something of the form in which we visualize the final end, the process by which we think to reach it.

5. Here, then, we have set ourselves a problem. If the laity are increasingly indifferent to the religion we offer, if it is being crowded out of their lives by other interests, surely the *prima facie* inference is that it is no longer meeting their needs, it has lost touch with their life and its interests. It might be that the Christian faith is no longer adequate to modern life. If we reject that unhesitatingly, may it not be, must it not be, that our presentation of it is inadequate ?

Is not this what the laity say of us ? Some speak in the bitterness of their soul, and from bitterness it is not easy to learn. But I can summarize a very sympathetic pronouncement, made after careful study: "You (clergy or ministers) offer us an authoritative teaching, but you do not show us, and much the larger number of us cannot see, what it, or the religion based on it, has to do with our lives."

6. Here I throw out two suggestions, which, I believe, lie at the root of our problem.

(i.) Is not "religion," as it is taught and practised to-day, extraordinarily temperamental ? Why are women so much more religious than men ? Slavs and Celts (whether Protestant Welsh or Catholic Irish) than Teutons ? As a rule, religion makes more appeal to the leisured than to the very busy, to the docile than to the energetic, to children than to adults.

The facts are well known, but surely there must be something wrong with our religion. Does it not amount to saying

that the more men need God, the less they can find Him? I fancy that may be true, but can He not find them? Is God really further from one sort of mind than from another? Did He not make them all, and does He not love all He made?

7. (ii.) There is another form of distinction with which we are even more concerned.

We have to recognize that in everything—intellectual, artistic, moral, or physical, in study, music, ruling, or sport—there are enthusiasts to whom the thing is a joy in itself, and the common herd, who use it, not very zealously, for purposes of their own. The enthusiasts are not always experts, but the experts are always among the enthusiasts.

8. The teachers and other professional exponents of these arts are mostly drawn from the enthusiasts and experts, and reflect their outlook. They often have a following of devout amateurs, but they are a little remote from the "laity" proper. And the difference of types is rendered the more perplexing because it is so little realized or understood.

Thus, in our higher education, the average dull student is taken through the elementary parts of the scholar's course, as if he were merely a poor specimen of the scholar class who could not be got very far. In reality, he is a quite different person, with quite different needs and possibilities.

9. In religion, the difference occurs all through Church history, where the enthusiasts get different names. In the early Church they might make schisms—the Spirituals of Montanus, the Pure of Novatian.

Monasticism provided enthusiasm with a life of its own. In some ways it did harm, for enthusiasts are always apt to be contemptuous of the "secular" (worldly) Church and its common people. In the Middle Ages conversion meant entering, and religion meant living in a monastery. But on the whole monasticism was a great help; anyhow, there were no more schisms.

Protestantism drove out the monks in order to reassert the common life, but, in result, the religious enthusiasts began to claim the Church for themselves, and schisms multiplied rapidly. Lutheranism developed the *pietische*. Calvin regarded the Church as essentially "the elect"; Independents, as the "gathered congregation of the saints"; Wesleyans, as "the converted." Anglo-Catholic clergy talk habitually of "the faithful," and, somewhat impatiently, of the ordinary laity as "nominal Churchmen," although in personal ministry the clergy are sympathetic and sensible.

10. This peculiar outlook does not appear equally among Roman Catholics. In France, they distinguish between

devoués and *pratiquants*, but there is no impatience over the latter. All our foreign missions are extremely careful over baptism. The minimum preparation is often a year. The Romans and Orthodox are much freer. They have more belief in mass conversion.

11. Let us take a quite normal case within common experience. A new vicar goes to a neglected country parish. After five years' earnest work he has a following of the faithful, and a fair congregation, but the children are his best hope. After fifteen or twenty years you will find very nearly the same number of faithful and of churchgoers. The children are still hopeful, but the vicar has ceased to hope. He is becoming discouraged. In thirty years it may be a neglected parish. Very much the same thing happens in every chapel.

In the country you know exactly what you have done. In the towns the numbers are so large, the opportunities of gathering a congregation from all round are so obvious, that the clergy may escape discouragement in mere busyness, and lose sight of how few are really being reached.

I add a quotation : "It is generally agreed that, while parochial missions strengthen the faithful and recover a few lapsed, they bring in practically no new converts."

That seems to me conclusive. Religion as we have it, and as we teach it, is the Religion of the religious—*i.e.*, of a certain limited class. An earnest priest will gather in that number. He will very rarely indeed get beyond it.

12. Before we try to study the position of the common man, we had better ask what we mean by religion. People use the word very freely and very vaguely. I am not much concerned over the correct or right use of the word; I want to get a clearer notion of what is actually meant.

Religion is, first, the whole *activity* of our nature, the thoughts, words, feelings, deeds, which are addressed to God, or done for His sake. Aquinas also calls it the virtue, or habit, of so acting.

Modern writers, with much rhetoric, call it a personal *relation* to God, but that cannot stand, for, if so, no baptized person could be irreligious. What is really meant is "the *consciousness* of personal relation to God," and even to that we must add "expressing itself in a certain activity," for we should hardly call a man religious merely by his consciousness if, in fact, he neither prayed, nor loved, nor did anything in consequence. St. James speaks of religion very emphatically as purely an action, and this is the only passage in the New Testament where the word is ever applied to Christianity.

13. I think we are now in a position to consider what the

exact difference is between these classes of people and what is involved in it.

Professor James divided men into the interior-living and the exterior-living, and I think that there can be no doubt that the religious—the "pious," *pietesche*—belong quite distinctively to the interior-living class. The devotional books, which represent the ideals of the class, speak habitually of the cultivation of the interior life.

14. (i.) Everyone will recognize that the ordinary layman—of course, I do not mean only the unordained—is characteristically exterior-living. He is interested in his work, in what there is to do or what there is doing. He may be interested in other folk's motives, but only if they have some practical outcome. He is well aware, uncomfortably aware, of the complexity of his own motives, but he has a great dislike of introspection, of studying the state of his own inside.

15. (ii.) We Catholics especially have rather a dread of individualism, but this interior life of developed personal consciousness is intensely individual. Newman's well-known remark about "God and his own soul, as the only two unquestionable realities," is its classical expression. The exterior life, on the other hand, is essentially common. Its activities are carried on with, and for, others.

Individualism is, to some extent, a personal character, but its development depends on education. Intellectualism always individualizes. It depends also on an assured social and economic status. The man with a bit laid by likes to have his own opinions and to go his own way. The man who lives from hand to mouth cannot risk it. Of course, a strong personal character may go beyond all barriers, but as a rule it only affects the use we make of opportunities.

16. (iii.) The question of individualism dominates the vital question of conversion. Apparently all religionists assume as an axiom that the conversion of England means the conversion of Englishmen—the winning, persuading, converting of the whole by number (so far as it can be won). I do not remember meeting anyone who had visualized or could imagine anything else. I very particularly do *not* want to shock or startle anyone, but in my own mind I am quite persuaded that this thing cannot be done.

I have accumulated above a certain amount of evidence from our own and other experience to that effect, for the limited number of people who can be really got in is intimately connected with the limited number of possible "conversions" in the sense we are thinking of. I could add to this evidence indefinitely.

17. Calvin quite freely accepted the idea of a limited circle

of elect. Wesley rejected it with horror. He went out to convert everyone. Though he did not, in fact, succeed with everyone, his influence was enormous, yet the result in effective conversions—vast enough in total number—was pitifully small relatively. I do not think anyone can read through his published diary—year after year—without seeing that universal conversion, such as he dreamt of, was not possible.

A country vicar said to his Bishop with some bitterness—"The agricultural labourer is not, and is not going to be, a communicant." Theologically it sounds startling; but I do think the vicar was stating the facts as he saw them. "I have tried for years. I can't do it. None of us can." Personally I accept the jury's verdict, but I add—"until they all do."

18. "But how can we get all, if we cannot get them one by one?" I have alluded before to our foreign missionaries, and I think they know the answer. All our actual work is being done on the basis of real conversions—*i.e.*, of individuals, and the results are small. But outside our converts there is a much wider permeation; the Gospel—like Wesley's preaching—is an influence, dissolving the cement of heathenism, preparing what is substantially a mass conversion.

19. Psychology just now is a too exciting word. Let us call it a question of mentality. Anyone, who will think over his own friends, will know that there are a limited number who have ideas, who can follow a vision, an ideal, a theory, and whose imagination can grasp its possibilities. The average man, especially the average Englishman, cannot do this. He wants to see a thing at work, and that it can do its work, before he commits himself. He likes to feel other people see it too. I am inclined to think the modern contemptuous language about the "herd instinct" is as wicked as the old-new novelist's contempt for conventional morality. Anyhow, it is equally silly. But are not we idealists, moralists, religionists, a little in a hurry to charge the common man with moral cowardice because he will not come out and stand alone? It isn't that. It is much more want of imagination, and a consequent distrust of his own theoretical judgment.

20. Here we come to the temperamental difference. To certain people, especially to women, and quite commonly with children, the soul and the personal relation to God are realized quite naturally and without much difficulty. One's duties to others are a consequence. The recognition of God's work in the world comes last. As things are, it does not always come at all. This seems to be the normal road of religion.

The normal laity are increasingly indifferent to religion. That is confessed. They are primarily interested in the world

and in their work; they are very little interested in their souls. Does it follow that they are not interested in God? God is interested in their souls, I know; is God not interested in their work? Does not the Creed begin from this very point that God is the Maker and Ruler of all things—of just that world with which they are concerned? And would not just this faith be the natural gateway for them into a higher life?

21. If we look at the thing from the side of duty, certainly it is plain that, as God has made the world, the layman's first duty is his work, and it is difficult to say that a man is wrong if his first duty is the thing he most enjoys. Theologically, it follows that his first duty must be his true "religion"—*i.e.*, the service he is specially called to render to God.

I am not, however, going to quote *laborare est orare*, for I doubt if it is quite true, and I am sure that it is very misleading. To work is not at all necessarily to pray. I would only say that it can be made into prayer, but it will not be so made unless the layman will take some pains over prayer of a more direct sort.

22. The consecration of secular business, of common daily life, is not easy, nor is it possible to rest in it as a final attainment. The layman does not like analyzing the endless complexity of his motives, but he is quite well aware how much everything depends upon what fashion of a man he is. This "personality-regardingness" is a poor show of which he is rightly shy. I do not think it is at all off his line of thought to recognize that in the true end nothing will be left except this single question, "Have you loved God or yourself?" Life is very full and very interesting; so is each day. When life comes to its end, when a man has done all he can, he must go to God and leave it to God, and he had much best practise doing these things as the days pass.

The Christian faith is not merely a thing to die by nor to sleep on. The religionist may find it best in his hours of prayer. To the layman prayer may be something of an effort, but he will reach his highest attainment when that faith in God has become the secret of the courage, the joy, the fun, of the day's work; the assurance of its worth-whileness; the restraint of self-assertion in success; the refuge against the inevitable disillusionment of life.

23. The factors of life are, therefore, very much the same for everyone. But not only the proportions are different, the order is different. Because, the substance of life is common, the experts and the professionals in any direction can do things for the layman which he cannot do well for himself. Because the order is different, each man has to go on his own road,

and has to do his own walking. One condition of helpfulness is to realize how little you can do for others.

Most of us religionists are plain folk. We admire the intellectualists, but we have no desire to be like them, though we should be none the worse if they would help us to be a bit more intelligent. When, however, the intellectualists start dictating to us, then we stop admiring them. Partly in self-defence we may stop trying to be intelligent, which is a pity.

As some religionists have set their hope on a saintly clergy, others believe in the influence of " a nucleus of really converted Christians." Are not all enthusiasts saying in their hearts, " Ah ! if only other people were more like us !"? The meaning outsiders give to words like saints, pious, Methodists, shows, no doubt, many things, but amongst the rest, how little men are inclined to walk up other folk's roads, and how much they resent being told what they ought to do.

24. The problems of social and economic reform have provided the religious mind of to-day with a new interest in the layman and his business. Can the layman be persuaded to substitute " the service of the community," as a working motive, for the " profits of the individual "? I once asked a devout priest what the Creed had to do with a boy's football. He could only answer that it ought to teach him to play a clean and good-tempered game. Both seem to me a pathetic misunderstanding of the layman's needs.

Surely the businessman's business is to deliver the goods, and the footballer's business is to put in a goal or two. Is God only tolerant of what they are doing, and not really interested in it ? Is our Christian faith merely a negative code of what a man should not do—in the style " If you're going upstairs, dear, just see what baby's doing and tell him he mustn't "?

Of course, there are moral questions, which the layman in the zest of his activity is apt to forget, and there are more fundamental questions as to the system itself which he might prefer to ignore. We, parsons and religionists, may do something to keep these moral questions before his mind, but it is his conscience which must face them, and his experience alone which can find an answer. We have something of a brother's right to plead and to urge, but there is too much moral dictation and judgment about what God has given to others.

Surely the first calling of our faith is to give the workers a bit of cheer, to tell them God likes to see them get on with it, and no doubt was quite pleased with that last goal. The more we can get them to believe that, the less likely they are to get goals that won't please Him. And getting their consciences

to work is an infinitely more useful thing than any quantity of ready-made judgments of ours.

25. Of what the expert can do, I picked up a story from Chicago. A broken-down labourer from the stockyards wandered into a popular lecture on the latest agriculture, and suddenly the decorous silence was broken by a passionate cry from the back: "How was I to know that all it wanted was what you call potassium?" Lost youth, lost capital, lost hope, lost the chance of decent family life, all for want of a little scientific knowledge of the ingredients of the soil. There is a great work for you experts, but if you would help the struggling farmer, you must realize that he wants what he wants on a commercial scale. The elaborate fertilizers you sell in 1-lb. tins are only of use for window boxes and amateurs' fancy flower gardens.

26. I have an immense belief in the power of catholicity. The faith of the Creed, faith in what God is and has done for all mankind, has a simplicity and a universality which neither Electionism, nor Conversionalism, nor modernist Experiences, concerned with the differences of human states, can possibly approach, true and valuable as they may be. Sacramental worship, in its balance of simple gift and perfected response, simple act and deep feeling, has a directness, and yet a variety of appeal which neither the discipline of Puritanism, the Method of Wesley, nor the beautiful and restrained piety of Evangelicalism, can ever maintain—valuable, often beyond all valuing, as they also may be.

But it is the catholic catholicity of faith and obligation which meets the needs of the common man. If it did not, it would not be catholic. "Devotions" are not catholic in this sense. They are the devotions of the devout, the satisfaction of a particular type of mind. If they were not, they would be obligations and not devotions.

27. The proper attitude of the clergy towards the laity, and some of the very practical reasons which have made that attitude difficult—certain peculiarities of the Anglican lay mind and the processes which have created or developed those peculiarities—I must leave to another occasion. I want to point out here some of the results upon religion of its virtual isolation as the cult of a special class.

If it is true that the laity cannot be saved without the help of the experts, of the clergy—and I believe it is true—it is also true that the religious will never be "safe"—whole, right, sane—without the layman. "If anyone wants to be saved, the first necessity is that he should hold the *Catholic* faith"—the faith that is for everybody. And faith is further defined as worship

(not at this point as opinions); the Catholic Faith, as worship of one God, Trinity and Unity.

28. I take this word "hold" in the Pauline sense (1 Cor. iii.). Whatever God gives you to build, you must keep to this foundation. But we all, religionists or lay, ought to recognize what a snare the passion of building is. Mr. Coulton has pointed out the anxiety which the fascination of architecture caused to the early Cistercians and Franciscans. Mr. Edmund Bishop showed the process in church ornamentation—how the altar, which at first stood solid and alone as the centre of the Church, was "dignified" by accessories, until it was entirely obscured by them.

We know well enough what happens when politicians and businessmen, soldiers and artists, forget their caution, their fear and reverence, of the greatness and mystery of life which are in God, through the mere enthusiasm of getting away with their own show. But was Luther so very wrong in maintaining that the eternal Gospel of God had been lost under the multitude of observances which he called "works"?

29. "This is the Catholic Faith that we worship one God—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." However different are the roads we go by there is only one salvation for anybody. We all take God for granted, and we religionists at least use the name freely. I do not think we at all realize how much and how widely in England, America, Japan—I name the three countries I know—the worship of religion has displaced the worship of God.

I am not using "religion" in any fancy sense. What faith has the outsider heard from us? I could give some curious stories, both of private soldiers and educated men, who met a direct statement of the Credal Gospel with the puzzled question, "If that is what the parsons mean, why do they not tell us?" We may be quite sure we have told them, but they are quite unconscious of it. We may be quite sure we hold it ourselves. In a formal sense no doubt we do, but is the consciousness of our life so clear? It is that of which the outsider judges.

30. In non-"Catholic" circles we can see how a devout "Jesus-worship" has led straight to the modernist "cult of the historic Jesus"—a sort of glorified saint worship without invocation—in which all sense of God, other than as a name for ideals and the higher self, has disappeared.

Are we Catholics so entirely right? The devotion of religion, the work of prayer and meditation, is a most real service of God. Yet I do not think anyone can watch the pursuit of popular "devotions," the hunt for something more

novel, exciting, spicy, without seeing the truth of Edmund Bishop's warning about the overlaying of essentials in the development of accessories, often enough of the most untheological and unhealthy description.

Apart from the guilds and coteries by which such things are practised, in our normal parish services, do we not hear far more sermons on confession than on sin and rightness of life; on the Sacraments than on redemption or reconciliation; on the authority of the Church than on the fear of God? I fancy one might hear more of the use of "devotions" than about saying one's prayers. A quite Catholic chaplain said roundly: "To many of us, God is mainly an excuse for the Mass." In the old Anglican days we parsons used to urge "coming to church" as if it was the whole duty of man. In these more advanced days we call it "coming to Mass." Possibly it is a much better cry, but is it not all off the point? To those naturally interested in religion, the cult of religion is so terribly easy; to the laity, with their interest elsewhere, it seems so futile.

H. H. Kelly.

RELIGION AND MARRIAGE

This is a time of much perplexity and anxiety with regard to the moral and spiritual welfare of the nation. Much has been written and said about the deterioration of the youth of the country, and with reference to the development of a spirit of flippancy and carelessness which promises evil for the near future. Some people try to comfort themselves by saying that the general unrest, the prevalent lack of a sense of duty, and the attitude of the people in general towards religion, is the aftermath of the Great War. They point to the difficult times that were experienced after the Napoleonic wars, and tell us hopefully that a great revival is at hand, and that we may hope for an improvement in religious opinion and practice as great as was achieved by the combined results of the Evangelical and Tractarian movements. Those who love the country are only too willing to turn a hopeful ear to these consolations, but many of us feel that there can be no harvest without a seedtime, and that there is no hope for the stability of a house which is not built upon solid foundations. Also we believe that any such revival as is promised us must be preceded by views on marriage and family life which are founded on a really religious basis.

A priest who is distinguished for his common sense told his congregation a few weeks ago that they could never be short of subjects for intercession so long as the daily paper was

delivered at their doors, for day by day it affords a compendium of the world's needs, sins, and sorrows. No one reading the daily paper can doubt that the nation has indeed gone very far from righteousness. The police court news, the law reports (especially so far as they concern divorce), and much of the incidental matter, is at once a humbling record and an inspiring manual suggesting heads of intercession which should cause us, as did the woes of Israel cause the prophet Daniel, "to speak, and pray, and to confess his sin and the sin of his people Israel."

One condition of effectual repentance and reform is the possession of knowledge. Before the political and social life of our Empire can be reformed the people at large must learn what is wrong in the present condition of things, and what is the goal at which we have to aim. Many books and pamphlets have appeared dealing with this important subject, and from among them we would select three which deal with different aspects of the subject and appeal to three different classes of members of society.

Men, Women and God: A Discussion of Sex Questions from the Christian Point of View, by the Rev. A. Herbert Gray, D.D., was published this year by the London Student Christian Movement, and primarily appeals to the members of that society. *Sex Knowledge*, with a special chapter on Birth Control, by Miss Norah March, B.Sc., published by W. Foulsham and Co., Ltd., price 9d., seeks its public chiefly among young married couples setting out on life's pilgrimage. While the third, *State Marriage and Christian Marriage*, by the Rev. R. H. Hobday, M.A., and published by S.P.C.K., is directed almost entirely to the task of pointing out the difference between the State and the Christian conception of marriage. It is the most learned of the three, and probably appeals to the clergy, to lawyers, and to the more educated sections of society. It is only a small book, but it is full of information at once terse and readable.

In *Men, Women, and God* Dr. Gray addresses both sexes, and chiefly the young folk. In the Introduction he tells us that he has followed this plan because mutual knowledge and understanding between the sexes is essential to the progress and happiness of the human race. He reminds us that sex is no accident in our humanity; it was ordained by God for our advantage, but to secure its blessings human co-operation with Divine Grace is necessary. He reminds us that at the present day it is impossible to return to Victorian ignorance of sex matters, but that it rests with parents and other guardians of children to determine whether knowledge of sex matters shall

be true, pure, and reverent, or whether it shall be garbled, inadequate, and vile. As a foundation for this special knowledge, Dr. Gray would have young people recognize that the spirit is to be the dominant partner, controlling and mastering, but not annihilating, the flesh.

In the first chapter the author discusses the method of conveying sex knowledge to children, and asks that it should be conveyed in frankness, truth, and beauty. All efforts at keeping children in ignorance are not only futile, but such repression leads to injury of the mind and of the moral nature, as is abundantly recognized by Freud and other psycho-analysts. The question immediately arises, From whom should the children derive their knowledge of the facts of life, and at what age should that knowledge be communicated to them? We are very glad to be able to agree with Dr. Gray that fathers and mothers are the persons upon whom this duty naturally falls. At the same time we have to remember that in some instances fathers and mothers are unable or unwilling to undertake this sacred duty, which then devolves on their representatives, usually on head masters and mistresses. It is sometimes said that the clergy or the doctor are better fitted to do this than is the teacher; but however well fitted to convey the knowledge truthfully, delicately, and sympathetically, the clergyman seldom gets into touch with the child until the time of Confirmation, when it is already too late to secure the purity of the child's mind, and the doctor usually only when want of knowledge has caused physical injury and moral distress. Therefore it appears to us that the head teacher of the school attended by the child should make friends with the parents and find out whether they can and will give the necessary instruction, or failing that, whether they will delegate the duty. Now and again one hears an outcry against some teacher who has given the children information as to the facts of sex without the parents' knowledge and permission. When this occurs it generally means that there has been a failure to take the parents into confidence, and to discuss the matter with them in a friendly manner, for when this is done, and the father and mother are led to understand why the knowledge ought to be imparted and the method that the head teacher intends to adopt, there is seldom or never any difficulty. As a matter of fact, ignorant and prejudiced as some parents must be, it is quite possible to put the matter to them in such a way as to lead to their acquiescence and even approval.

As to the time at which the necessary information should be given, it is impossible to express this in terms of years and months, for one child may demand and need information at

the age of five or six years, while another would neither ask for nor profit by it up to the time of puberty. In every case the amount of information and the time at which it should be given must depend partly on the mental and moral development of the child and partly on his environment. Children brought up in tenement houses and where the home consists of one, or at most two, rooms must necessarily require enlightenment much earlier than a child in happier circumstances. The great rules to follow are: (1) Be always kind, truthful and clear; (2) never give information which is not asked for or which is manifestly beyond the child's understanding; and (3) take care that both boys and girls know the main facts before they come to the age of puberty, so that the knowlege conveyed may not have an evident personal bearing, and yet may be defended by adequate knowledge before they go out to face the difficulties and temptations of the outer world.

A loving and watchful parent or guardian will receive guidance not only from the child's questions and remarks, but also from the incidence of domestic events, such as is supplied by the life-history of domestic animals and pets, and the birth of younger members of the family. Another indication of the necessity for a heart-to-heart talk with little people is afforded by the observation in them of habits of self-abuse. This evil is much commoner than most people think it is. It exists not only in men and boys (probably to the extent of 75 per cent.) but also to an almost similar degree in girls and women. This habit often passes unrecognized, and yet the signs of its existence are clear enough. The child who is an habitual fidget, constantly scratching, rubbing, and picking at different parts of its person, the child who never meets the eye, who flushes and pales alternately without sufficient reason, the child who shuns the society of his fellows, and who altogether gives an impression of a sullen, furtive, and uncongenial disposition, should be carefully watched, for he has probably already acquired the habit of masturbation, or is at any rate a likely subject for this evil habit.

Parents and guardians should also know that among the commonest causes of self-abuse are the irritation due to knickers and trousers too tight in the fork, to the migration of threadworms from the opening of the bowel forwards, to the need for circumcision, and to certain irritations, all of which lead to cause the child to an improper handling of the external organs of generation. The public in general has an erroneous belief that this evil habit is rarely present, whereas it is common, and it tends to lead those who practise it to unsoundness of mind or some great physical disaster, whereas on the psychical side

there is but little harm, and the habit does not in itself lead to mental and nervous disease. It is true that nearly all people of unsound mind masturbate, but it is equally true that both lunacy and masturbation are the evidence, and not the cause, of nervous instability.

Dr. Gray reminds us that we cannot keep the sexes apart. He truly says: "God made them gloriously different that they might enjoy and help each other," "Woman is not only physically different from man, she is different mentally, morally, and spiritually, and that is why we need her so much in all life's departments." He wisely urges comradeship between lads and lassies, that is to say the proper use of social intercourse, not its abuse, and he urges the necessity of the abstention of young people from familiarities. It is only too true that girls may be unduly provocative in dress and in manner, and they may carelessly, or even innocently, permit physical contact, for instance kissing, which perhaps may not stir them, but which is very likely to excite boys and young men beyond the limits of their self-control. This is, of course, unfair.

In Chapter III. Dr. Gray discusses the characteristics of love, and warns us that for the perfection of this passion the union must be of the two whole natures, and he quotes as illustrations the phenomena of conversion and of mystical union. He reminds us that St. Paul regards this absorbing and fruitful love as the type of union between Christ and His Church; and, further, he draws the inference that as physical union should result in the joys of parenthood, so conversion and mystical union should eventuate not only in hard labour, but in the fruit of a transfigured life and the magnificent results of enthusiastic endeavours to serve God and man.

In another chapter the author considers three different moral standards, social, legal, and Christian, and points out the superiority of the latter. According to the laws of society there may be sexual intercourse between man and woman without the sanction of marriage, and in justification of this breach of law and order they plead love and self-expression. But, as Dr. Gray urges, the love which is not strong enough to bind two individuals for life, and love which fails to fulfil its correlative responsibilities, is neither true nor strong; it is not the perfect surrender and the mutual worship which alone are able to sublimate and to sanctify physical union.

It is rather strange that, considering Dr. Gray's true and sympathetic view of the obligations of the married state and his assertion that true marriage is based on perfect mutual surrender, he should still think that divorced persons can

remarry. However, he says that this is not his final word on the subject (see note to p. 69).

Chapter VI., on "A Man's Struggle," is one of the best in the book, full of wisdom and good practical advice. Put very briefly, the headings are: Continence before marriage and chastity during marriage are never harmful. That the struggle is between the service of Diana and the service of Venus. That the votaries of the former who live full and active lives with much and varied exercise, who love athletics, swimming, bathing and rowing, will find that the control of their bodies and of the desires of their lower nature is comparatively easy, whereas those who serve the flesh and who are incapable of saying "No" to themselves are in danger of losing their true manhood, and with it their predestined and rightful place in this life and in that which is to come. The man's struggle against the lusts of the flesh must be like the struggle against a military foe, where frontal attack and mass movements may be foredoomed to failure, but the constant pushing on, the working round obstacles and clever flank movements, are likely to ensure success. The constant fight against impure thoughts, dirty stories, and unworthy selfish deeds, is likely to lead, as it did in St. Paul's case, to the glad assurance of victory, so that our combatants may be able to say as he did: "I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

The chapter on "A Girl's Early Days" is also wise and helpful. It points out girls' many difficulties, the ground facts associated with their rebellion against law and conventions, and the potent influence on their conduct and happiness of what the psycho-analysts call "the inferiority complex." Dr. Gray points out that to many girls and women (and, indeed, he might have said to many human beings) religion is the great help. No doubt, especially in the early years of life, a girl's religion is apt to be unduly emotional, and the test of its strength and sincerity comes with the call to express enthusiasm and devotion in terms of unselfish and strenuous work for others. Possibly in another edition Dr. Gray might see his way to emphasize the great truth that even love for the Heavenly Bridegroom is operative and acceptable only in proportion as it expresses itself in loving and unselfish deeds.

The chapter on "Birth Control" commencing on p. 149 of the book is short and not so satisfactory from our point of view as the rest of the book. He emphasizes the truths that "for two healthy young persons to marry with the definite intention of having no children is, I believe, an unchristian thing. . . . Artificial attempts to postpone the arrival of a first child are a deplorable mistake. . . . Children mean very hard work,

and, of course, they restrict the freedom of parents to pursue their own pleasure, and use up a large proportion of the family income. But these things are a blessing in disguise." So far, so good; but I think he seems to fail to point out how husband and wife can live together according to the ordinance of God, and that he possibly undervalues the power of self-control and good management in helping married couples to confront the problem of duly spacing the family, and on the whole he appears to believe that, for the majority of people, conception control is the necessary and even the better way.

In Chapter XI., which deals with "Unhappy Marriages," we have some good advice and wise comment on the causes of unhappiness in marriage. There is no doubt that people who marry hastily and on the basis of fascination, physical admiration, and mere animal passion, cannot expect happiness. As in all the relations of life, the character of partners in a business or under a contract must largely influence the conduct of the business and the fulfilment of the contract. If married people bring little into the union but selfishness, discourtesy, and openly avowed desire to avoid its duties, it must necessarily lead to mutual dissatisfaction, to a breach of contract, and probably to the divorce court. The partners to a marriage should remember that they are both frail, erring human beings, that far from being angels, or even extraordinarily good men and women, they are just very ordinary human beings beset by the usual temptations and difficulties of life. Dr. Gray points out the one and only hope of happiness in the married life. As he says "it has been plain beyond all question that the trouble in the sphere of marriage could not be mended till something had happened to the persons concerned—in other words, till they had learnt to seek and use the help of God."

Appended to the book is *A Brief Sketch of some of the Physiological Facts*, by A. Charles E. Gray, M.D.Edin. Dr. Gray is the brother of the author of the book, and in this short appendix of half a dozen pages he gives a wonderfully succinct and clear account of sexual facts in the different orders of creation. It is scientifically true, commendably brief, and quite serious without any nauseous sentimentality. It is, however, uncertain how far such a direct and plain statement of the facts is useful or desirable. Certainly if the knowledge is to be conveyed to students it could hardly be better done, and there are people who think that the safety of the young in the present day depends largely on the completeness of detail in which sexual knowledge is conveyed to them, inevitable as such knowledge is.

Miss March's book is entirely different in character from

Dr. Gray's, and practically ignores the influence of religion and of the love of God in the difficult matter of sexual relations. In the Introduction Miss March gives a remarkably good sketch of married happiness and traces it to a foundation in love, but if Divine love were in her mind she does not mention it. In Chapter I. she tells us, very truly, that the root cause of venereal disease, of divorce, and of illegitimacy, is ignorance, and she reminds us that the sexual passion is a " master force " which the human race shares with the rest of creation. In Chapter II. there is a sketch of the reproductive organs from their non-functional condition in the embryo onwards, and we are told that the sexual instinct may be said to exist even in infancy, although conscious carnal desire does not do so. The subject of sublimation is well dealt with, and so, too, is the mutual attraction and help of man and woman, but many of us could not possibly agree with Miss March when she tells us that " all people derive pleasure from sexual thoughts." All doctors who practise among women, and who win their confidence, know that one of the conditions which most distress them is their inability to control their thoughts. Chapter III. deals chiefly with three phases of the affections: the auto-erotic, or self-regarding, phase which characterizes infancy; the homo-sexual period when like turns to like, and absorbing friendships are formed with members of the same sex, chiefly noticeable in girls; lastly comes the hetero-sexual period, when the attraction is between the opposite sexes. The subject is well worked out and is interesting, and so, too, is Chapter IV., dealing with the instinct of self-preservation and the reproductive instinct, the latter being subserved by the endocrine organs, such as the ovaries and testes, etc. We are reminded of the enormous value of the internal secretion of these organs, which has so great an effect on the development of the body and more especially on the mental, moral, and sexual characteristics of man and woman.

To this follows an account of the different methods of reproduction, commencing with the absolutely asexual, exemplified by budding, in the cases of jellyfish and some other animals and vegetables; next the sexual methods illustrated by sperm and germ cells of the lily, the poppy, and the fish; and lastly, in the higher orders of creation, where the young are developed within the mother's body. With this change in the method of development of the young comes a difference in the method of fertilization, which is now made to depend on the sexual union of male and female. A very interesting paragraph reminds us of a fact that is frequently ignored—namely, that the developing embryo within the womb of its mother is not

living a parasitic existence, taking all and giving nothing, but that the condition is one of *symbiosis*, or exchange of gifts, the child contributing to its mother's welfare in return for her overwhelming contribution to its existence.

Miss March has some words of wisdom on psycho-physiologic relationships, and of the mutual influence of body and mind. Like Dr. Gray, she warns us that girls and women should dress and act with modesty and reticence, and that they should refrain from provocativeness.

Chapter VI., on "Birth Control," is professedly the most important in the book, but to our mind it is not entirely satisfactory. It resolves itself into the opinion that birth control concerns the individual couple only.

There is much to be learnt from each of the three books under review, and we must express our appreciation of the clearness and sincerity with which the three authors have presented the different views of the great subject on which they write. Dr. Gray's book is invaluable for the help and instruction of the students for whom it is primarily intended, but it will be equally useful to many young couples and to the community at large. Miss March's book is distinguished by its scientific accuracy and the straightforward manner in which she brings facts before her readers, although from our own point of view it is to be regretted that she does not invite us to consider the religious foundation and sanction of married love.

MARY SCHARLIEB.

NOTE.

As we go to press, a correspondent writes with reference to the study entitled "Oded and the Ruhr" in our last issue:

"Another reason for retaining the story of Oded in the Lectionary is the probability that the Samaritans' actions as recorded in verse 15 were in our Lord's mind when He told the parable of the 'Good Samaritan.' The parallels seem too close to be accidental—*i.e.*, clothing the naked, anointing, feeding, carrying on asses, Jericho.

"It would be interesting to know—but the wish is impossible of fulfilment—whether in the Synagogue Lectionary Deut. vi. or Lev. xviii. and xix. were read in conjunction with 2 Chron. xxviii. If so, it would give added point to the form the parable took in view of the *Lawyer's* answer."

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

We have received a copy of a pamphlet entitled *Twenty Paragraphs about the World Conference on Faith and Order*, which is to meet in May, 1925, at Washington, when it will receive the reports of the Committees appointed at Geneva in 1920. The General Secretary is Robert H. Gardiner, 174, Water Street, Gardiner, Maine, U.S.A. In England, information can be obtained from the Rev. E. Jauncey, Bretherton Vicarage, Ferrybridge, Yorks.

The following sentence appeared in our July number, p. 38: "Directly Christianity came into existence, Christians would require a statement of the Way." With reference to this a correspondent writes: "For an excellent account of the various 'statements of the Way,' see Dr. Jessopp's article in the *Expositor* for June, 1899, 'Primitive Liturgies and Confessions of Faith.'"

The Rev. W. C. Piercy writes:

Re your note in Theology on St. Luke x. 18.

At the time R.V. was published Professor T. S. Evans of Durham, one of the best Greek scholars of his day, poured scorn on the R.V. translation of this passage, ending rhetorically, "Who ever saw lightning *fallen?*" and asserting, as you do, contrary to the then popular opinion, that the aorist was not necessary to be translated by the past. A very curious happening then took place, a record of which I have previously communicated to the Church Press (see *Family Churchman*, December 30, 1892, p. 320), but of which little notice seems to have been taken, and of which your note seems to show you are unaware.

Someone at Cambridge, whether the printers on their own responsibility or one or more of the revisers (the "Company" having then ceased to sit), altered "fallen" back to "falling."

This is shown by copies in my possession and a comparison of dates.

An Oxford copy bought in May, 1881, and a Cambridge copy (Nonpareil 32mo) bought in June, 1881, both have "fallen." But a Cambridge copy bought in September, 1881 (Brevier 18mo edition) has "falling" restored, as in A.V. An Oxford copy of the whole R.V. (1885) still has "fallen." I do not happen to have a recent *Cambridge* R.V. by me; it would be interesting to know whether Cambridge has persisted in its revision of the R.V. or whether authority prevailed again after September, 1881. Perhaps some day the "falling" R.V. may be as valuable as the Vinegar Bible!

Also the Rev. A. H. Stanton:

Your readers may be interested to look up a discussion of the translation of this passage by the late Canon Evans, Professor of Greek in the University of Durham, in the *Expositor*, 1883, 2nd series, vol. iii., p. 164, in which he deals faithfully in his trenchant style with R.V. He then speaks of the rendering in A.V., "not only faultless but vivid in its order of the words: 'I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven.'"

IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

The firm of Töpelmann in Giessen is producing an attractive series of books designed especially for students who have lost five years owing to the war. Research has continued in spite of the difficulties of the times, so that the older books are not quite satisfactory; new books specially designed for the purpose will better help men to "catch up." The theological portion of the series is entrusted to competent hands. Readers can feel assured in view of the purpose of the series and the standing of the writers that they are given a fair summary of the present position as understood in Germany.

The volume dealing with Old Testament religion is by Professor Hölscher of Marburg (*Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion:* 1922) and contains so much that differs from the ordinary books current in English that a somewhat lengthy review may interest our readers. Let it be said at the outset that no Old Testament scholar can neglect this book, for such books are not written in England. Scholars so competent as Hölscher in this country would be loth to commit themselves to such downright statements. Our native caution is a valuable asset, but what Dr. Sanday used to say remains true, that one finds more to agree with in English books, but learns more from German.

For Hölscher history begins with the eleventh century, all before being legendary. The religion of the early days is reconstructed on the basis of the general psychology of primitive peoples, especially the Arabs before Mahomet, which it is assumed must have been the same in Palestine as elsewhere. The picture thus obtained is corroborated by survivals in the Old Testament and archæological discoveries. Since the religious development of Israel is largely a record of the mingling of native beliefs with those of the nomadic immigrants it is important to study Canaanite cults. These were very varied owing to the mixture of races. Babylonian ideas had taken firm root in the third millennium, but the influence of Asia Minor was of fundamental importance. As there so in Palestine tribal gods were worshipped, baals of places to whom fertility was due. Ceremonial impurity was practised in order to cause fertility by sympathetic magic.

The conquest of Palestine was twofold and the distinction between North and South is fundamental. Until David's time a broad Canaanite belt separated the two. Only for a short time were they joined under pressure of the Philistines. The Northern tribes came from the East and were very fully Canaanized. The Southern came from the South (or rather were in Judæa all the time) and maintained their connection with the desert. Kadesh for a long time was the seat of the cult of Yahweh. In the North the Canaanites and Hebrews coalesced to become one people and the former taught the immigrants agriculture and the religion connected with it. Local baals were worshipped and also Yahweh in Sinai. Yahweh was thought of as dwelling in the desert and coming to help when called upon. "The Angel of the Lord" was the messenger sent to Palestine by the desert God. The South always held the Yahweh cult more firmly. But in the main the first four centuries in Canaan were a time in which Yahweh was being gradually assimilated to the baals.

The beginnings of reform were due to the priests (see 1 Kings xv. 12, 13; 2 Kings xi.). The movement reached prophetic circles and Jehu enlisted its support. The terrible massacres which ensued were the first great victory of the desert God. Monotheism arose out of the new world-outlook caused by the Assyrian and Babylonian invasions.

Hölscher proposes a radical revision of dates in and around the exilic period. Ezekiel the prophet flourished in the exile, but the book of Ezekiel is much later. Deuteronomy is not the Book of the Law found in Josiah's reign, for it cannot be harmonized with the account in 2 Kings, but is an ideal construction of the priests, to be dated about 500. Nehemiah is 445 and "Ezekiel" between the two. Ezra is a legendary figure, a reflection of the reforms of Nehemiah. The theory that "P" was the law said to have been read by Ezra cannot be maintained. There is no indication in the Book of Ezra that the law was unknown; and "P" was a history book to which the legal parts were added later. Of the many interesting points in the latter part of the book we can mention only the treatment of the Samaritans, whose kinship with Judah was recognized until the fanatic age of the Maccabees. The cult at Gerizim and the cults in Egypt revealed by the papyri show that the law of the Central Sanctuary was theory rather than practice.

Enough has been said to show the importance of the book. The identity of Deuteronomy with Josiah's Book of the Law and of the Priestly Code with Ezra's Law are the cardinal points in the critical reconstruction which is now generally accepted in England. If these identifications are precarious then the whole matter must be reconsidered. Hölscher agrees with the conservatives in attacking them. But he moves on to yet more radical positions. He protests, however, against the absurdity of placing any parts of the prophets in the second century.

I cannot believe that his position is more than one stage in a movement which will eventually take us a long way from critical orthodoxy. Some of his arguments look as if they might eventually be consistent with more conservative views. That the South being always closely connected with the desert preserved the Yahweh cult in comparative purity and that the priests originated the reform movement are important admissions. The point at issue between Hölscher and the conservatives is whether the original cult of Yahweh was at a comparatively high level or whether Yahweh was a mere demon or jinn of the desert.

Professor Hölscher writes as an exact historian, and the conception of a revelation from on high does not appear in his pages. This does not mean that he disbelieves in revelation, but that as a scientific historian he must exclude theological considerations. That there is no *history* previous to Deborah is his deliberate conclusion. English scholars for the most part have a strong belief in the general trustworthiness of ancient tradition, and to reject Moses as legendary seems to them absurd scepticism. But it must be owned that, given the dates generally assigned to the Old Testament books, the existence of Moses cannot be demonstrated by strictly historical methods. However, neither Professor Hölscher nor we are content to leave the matter thus. The scanty data which alone are available for the early period are interpreted somehow. The extreme critical school interprets them in the light of primitive religions in any and every part of the world, the conservative in the light of the subsequent development of these crude beginnings—namely Christ.

W. K. L. C.

NOTICES

CHRISTIANITY MISUNDERSTOOD. By the Rev. Thomas J. Hardy, M.A. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. net.

Mr. Hardy's book is a collection of papers, also published separately at a popular price, attempting to state Christian doctrine so as to remove misconceptions. The book should prove useful for readers of fair education, especially, perhaps, those over thirty. For the post-war generation are apt to ask questions to which this book affords no direct answer. Their difficulties are largely due to undigested psychology, but Mr. Hardy practically ignores psychology—an omission which is all the more regrettable as he has written so well on the subject elsewhere. As a positive statement of Christian teaching the book is attractive. We should select for special commendation his clear statements on "revelation" and "salvation" and the chapter on "Church Christianity." While we are in the fullest agreement with his general position, not least where it conflicts with much popular theology, we regret that at times he states his arguments in forms that are likely to cause more misunderstanding than they solve. Thus he simplifies unduly the problems of miracles and minimizes the results of psychotherapy in such a way as to state what is untrue. A good deal has happened since Dr. Ryle's article composed in 1907 (p. 26). Mental analysis employed with suggestions has cured some cases of total blindness. Mention is made of the "miracles" of Lourdes. Why is he silent about the "miracles" of Christian Science? If there is one point that impartial investigation proves, it is that unaccountable cures are quite independent of the truth of any religious belief or, indeed, of any religious belief at all. Again, he writes without qualification, "We see everywhere in the human race the vestiges of a more glorious and perfect past" (p. 40). This needs explanation in view of the fact that evolution of morality can be traced historically. We hold most strongly that the true development of mankind has been perverted, but can we deny development? So, too, his use of the gospels is, at times, frankly uncritical—a dangerous proceeding in these days. And a study of the Revised Version is enough to show that his exegesis of Rom. ix. 5 (p. 70) is at least disputed. These instances are typical of a certain lack of intellectual thoroughness that diminishes the value of a valuable book. What we have to meet is not only misunderstandings, but the vague uncertainties which underlie them. Still, within its limits, we recommend this book as a fair and devout presentation of a reasonable faith. E. J. BICKNELL.

BOOK NOTES

Christian Yoga, or the Threefold Path of Union with God. By J. C. Winslow. S.P.G. 1s.

Mr. Winslow is well known as one of those missionaries who is making a gallant attempt to bring to India not only the special Anglican vision of Catholic truth but also the treasures of the undivided Church. His part in the experimental Liturgy recently sanctioned for the Diocese of Bombay deserves grateful recognition. In this little book he interprets India to the West. It contains four addresses dealing with *bhakti-*

marga, the way of loving devotion; *dnyāna-marga*, the way of knowledge; *karma-marga*, the way of works; and the Christian *yogi*, that is, the man in whom *Yoga*, union with God, has been achieved. The addresses are slight, but possess a rare charm and fragrance.

Silence and Worship. A Study in Quaker Experience. By T. E Harvey. Swarthmore Press. 2s.

Canon Hepher's books have introduced many Churchmen to Corporate Silence as a mode of worship. Here we have a Quaker studying the subject from the historical standpoint in the light of three centuries' experience.

The Roman Martyrology in Accordance with the Reforms of Pope Pius X: in which are to be found the eulogies of the Saints and Blessed approved by the Sacred Congregation of Rites up to the present time. Burns, Oates and Washbourne. 10s.

In accordance with primitive custom these commemorations of the saints are recited daily at Prime. Thus on October 27 we have the Vigil of SS. Simon and Jude; SS. Vincent, Sabina, Christeta, Florentius, Frumentius, Elesbaan; and Capitolina and Erotheis. The translation is literal. Phrases like "consummated martyrdom," "renowned for asperity of life," "offered his worthy life to Christ," "noble in merit," "noteworthy for the fame of virtues," occur frequently and jar upon the ear of those who have been brought up on the Authorized Version and Book of Common Prayer.

Light from Ancient Letters. By H. G. Meacham. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

A student of the Greek Testament will be introduced very happily to the papyri by this book. It stands midway between Dr. Milligan's great Lexicon, the concluding volume of which is expected in 1924, and his *Here and There among the Papyri* (1922), which is specially designed for students of the English Bible. The author's conclusions are based upon 208 private letters found in the Oxyrhyncus papyri. His chapters deal with Vocabulary, Grammar, Orthography, Epistolary, Character and Form, Subject-matter and Thought. References to the New Testament are given throughout.

Useful as the book is, it adds very little to the knowledge already available in the works of Deissmann, Milligan, and Moulton. Probably the great advance of knowledge possible in this field has already taken place. Mr. Meacham, in common with other writers on this subject, gives a good deal of irrelevant information. Frequently late papyri are quoted in illustration of a New Testament usage which is given in Liddell and Scott as the ordinary classical meaning. Is it really necessary to tell us that in the papyri ἀπαιτεῖν=ask payment, κάπηλος=shopkeeper, παραμυθία=consolation, ἀνακαθίζεσθαι=sit up? The examples given of the two last are from the fourth century A.D. The occurrence of σπεκουλάτωρ in a fourth-century letter is said to qualify the assertion that the word is "utterly un-Greek."

Christian Auto-Suggestion. By R. E. Roberts. S.P.C.K. 2s.

Canon Roberts has written a little book which is likely to be of great use to Churchpeople. From the fulness of personal experience he sketches a thoroughly Christian system of Auto-Suggestion. The famous formula "every day in every way I get better and better" is deliberately avoided.

From the Christian standpoint it is open to grave objection because physical and spiritual health are confused. We cannot become holy by asserting that we are. Canon Roberts avoids this snare by using thoroughly Christian formulas, and parish priests will be glad to know of a book which they can recommend to their people without any fear of lessening their grip on the faith.

The Methods of Theology. By H. L. Goudge, D.D. Mowbray. 1s.

The Inaugural Lecture of a Regius Professor is always interesting. The new Oxford Professor discusses three ways by which Theology works—those of faith, reason, and criticism—characteristic of the apostolic age, the thirteenth century, and our own time respectively. He makes the interesting suggestion that the subtleties of criticism may one day be as discredited as those of scholasticism.

Old Testament Life and Literature. By I. G. Matthews. Macmillan. 10s. 6d.

Here we have an excellent American textbook, compiled after the manner of Dr. Foakes-Jackson's *Biblical History*, suitable for a student confronted with an examination. It is written in a vigorous and painstakingly bright style, of which the following are fair examples. "Nor did the religious innovations (of Solomon), the new temple, and its ritual easily win the assent of the democratic north" (p. 125). Was the northern kingdom democratic in any sense readily intelligible to a young American? "When his (Jeremiah's) uncle in Anathoth grew panicky, owing to the rapid depreciation of land values, he purchased the estate for about $175.00" (p. 213). Of the second Temple (p. 257): "Processionals, with varied vestments, swinging censers, and genuflections developed apace. Calls to service, responses by the officers or the worshippers, passed imperceptibly over into chant and song. It was the seedbed of priestcraft, and during two centuries, through the natural development of home talent and the influx of forms from foreign climes, it flowered out into a well-ordered, stately, helpful worship." The examination will be passed presumably, but imagine the feelings of the examiner as he reads passages like the above mechanically reproduced in a hundred papers. Indeed, it would make an excellent question, quoted in full with "What is wrong in this?" appended.

Come ye Apart. The Association for Promoting Retreats. 6d.

This is a very useful little handbook calculated to do much good. Retreats are for all, including children. They must be real retreats; to relax the rule of silence is fatal. If a tithe of the energy spent on social work in connection with the Church were devoted to retreats, great results would follow. The very pioneers who, thirty or forty years ago, out of Christ-like compassion for the drab existence of the masses devoted their energies to the provision of wholesome pleasure would, if they lived now when cheap pleasures are abundant, recognize that new methods were needed.

This is familiar enough to our readers, we hope. It is reinforced by a startling statement, that the little books of instruction, useful twenty years ago, have outlived their usefulness owing to the growing incapacity to follow a connected train of thought. Even on the intellectual plane retreats are of untold value.

W. K. L. C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER.